arXiv:1302.0221v2 [math.OC] 15 Mar 2013

Balanced truncation for linear switched systems

Mihály Petreczky[a], Rafael Wisniewski[b], John Leth[b,*]

[a] *Univ Lille Nord de France, F-59000 Lille, France, and EMDouai, IA, F-59500 Douai, France*
[b] *Aalborg University, Dept. of Electronic Systems, Fr. Bajers Vej 7, C3-211, DK-9220 Aalborg Ost, Denmark*

Abstract

In this paper, we present a theoretical analysis of the model reduction algorithm for linear switched systems from [1, 2]. This algorithm is a reminiscence of the balanced truncation method for linear parameter varying systems [3]. Specifically in this paper, we provide a bound on the approximation error in L_2 norm for continuous-time and l_2 norm for discrete-time linear switched systems. We provide a system theoretic interpretation of grammians and their singular values. Furthermore, we show that the performance of balanced truncation depends only on the input-output map and not on the choice of the state-space representation. For a class of stable discrete-time linear switched systems (so called strongly stable systems), we define nice controllability and nice observability grammians, which are genuinely related to reachability and controllability of switched systems. In addition, we show that quadratic stability and LMI estimates of the L_2 and l_2 gains depend only on the input-output map.

Keywords: switched systems, model reduction, balanced truncation, realization theory.

---

1. Introduction

In this paper, we address certain theoretical problems which arise in model reduction of continuous- and discrete-time Linear Switched Systems (in this

---

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: `mihaly.petreczky@mines-douai.fr` (Mihály Petreczky), `raf@es.aau.dk` (Rafael Wisniewski), `jjl@es.aau.dk` (John Leth)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier *March 21, 2013*

work, referred to as LSS).

To describe the contribution of this paper in more details, we will first present an informal overview of balanced truncation for linear switched system which appeared in [1, 2]. In fact, this method has already been used for linear time varying systems in [3].

Consider a linear switched system of the form

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \delta(x)(t) & = & A_{q(t)}x(t) + B_{q(t)}u(t), \ x(t_0) = x_0 \\ y(t) & = & C_{q(t)}x(t). \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $\delta(x)(t) = \dot{x}(t)$ in continuous-time case, $\delta(x)(t) = x(t+1)$ in discrete-time case, A_q, B_q, C_q are $n \times n$, $n \times m$ and $p \times n$ matrices respectively, and the switching signal q maps time instances to discrete states in a set Q.

We seek to replace the system Σ by another one of smaller dimension, but which still adequately approximates the input-output behavior of Σ. The methods for continuous-time and discrete time LSSs are similar. Specifically, for continuous-time systems, we define the following *observability grammian* as any positive definite $\mathscr{Q} > 0$ such that

$$\forall q \in Q : A_q^T \mathscr{Q} + \mathscr{Q} A_q + C_q^T C_q < 0. \tag{2}$$

Likewise, define a *controllability grammian* as a positive definite $\mathcal{P} > 0$ that satisfies

$$\forall q \in Q : A_q \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{P} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T < 0. \tag{3}$$

By applying a suitable state-space isomorphism, the system can be brought into a form where $\mathcal{P} = \mathscr{Q} = \Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n)$ are diagonal matrices and $\sigma_1 \geq \ldots \geq \sigma_n > 0$. We will call the numbers $\sigma_1 \geq \ldots \geq \sigma_n > 0$ the *singular values* of the pair $(\mathcal{P}, \mathscr{Q})$. We also observe that $\sigma_i = \sqrt{\lambda_i(\mathcal{P}\mathscr{Q})}$, where $\lambda_1(\mathcal{P}\mathscr{Q}) \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n(\mathcal{P}\mathscr{Q})$ are the ordered eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}\mathscr{Q}$. Following the classical terminology, we will call a state-space representation *balanced*, if $\mathcal{P} = \mathscr{Q} = \Lambda$, where Λ is a diagonal matrix. We reduce the dimension of a balanced state-space representation by discarding the last $n - r$ state-space components.

Suppose that Σ is balanced. Consequently, the system matrices $\hat{A}_q, \hat{B}_q, \hat{C}_q$ of the reduced order system $\hat{\Sigma}$ are obtained by partitioning the matrices of the original system as follows

$$A_q = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_q & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_q = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{B}_q \\ \star \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_q^T = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_q^T, & \star \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\hat{A}_q, \hat{B}_q, \hat{C}_q$ are $r \times r$, $r \times m$ and $p \times r$ matrices respectively. The performance of this procedure has been extensively tested by means of numerical examples in [1, 2]. However, many theoretical questions remain open.

Problem formulation

We strive to find error bounds and to establish the invariance of the method with respect to state-space representation. In particular, we seek answers to the following questions:

1. **Error bounds**
   Can we state a bound on the error between the original system Σ and the reduced one $\hat{\Sigma}$, using some metric ? In particular, can we extend the well-known result from the linear case, by proving that
   $$||Y^{\Sigma} - Y^{\hat{\Sigma}}||_2 \leq 2(\sigma_{r+1} + \cdots + \sigma_n), \tag{4}$$
   where Y^{Σ} and $Y^{\hat{\Sigma}}$ are the input-output maps of Σ and $\hat{\Sigma}$ respectively, and $||.||_2$ denotes the L_2 norm of the switched system as defined in [4] ?

2. **Invariance of the L_2 (for continuous-time) and l_2 (for discrete-time) norm estimates on state-space representation**
   Is it possible to estimate the system norm in a manner which does not depend on the choice of the basis of the state-space ?

3. **Invariance of the grammians on state-space representation**
   Under which conditions the controllability and observability inequalities (2) and (3) and their discrete counterparts have solutions ? Does the existence of a solution to these inequalities depend on the choice of the state-space representation ? Can we characterize the set of observability/controllability grammians in a way which does not depend on the choice of the state-space representation but only on the input-output map ?

4. **Invariance of the singular values on state-space representation**
   Do the singular values of the system (i.e., the values $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$) depend only on the input-output map of the system or do they also depend on the choice of the state-space representation. Do they have a system theoretic interpretation ?

5. **System theoretic interpretation of the grammians**
   What is the relationship between grammians and observability / controllability of the switched systems. In the linear case, existence of strictly positive observability/controllability grammians implies observability/controllability of the system. Does this extend to the switched case ?

6. **Preservation of system theoretic properties by the reduced system**
   If the original system was reachable, observable, minimal, stable, etc., then will balanced truncation preserve these properties ?

The motivation for the first problem is clear. The motivation for questions 2–4 is the following. The formulation of balanced truncation does not a priory exclude the possibility that the choice of the state-space representation might influence the error bound. This would inhibit the applicability of the method, since the choice of the initial state-space representation is often circumstantial. In particular, the existence of a solution to the LMIs that are used for estimating L_2 and l_2 gains might depend on the choice of the state-space representation. In a similar manner, the existence of grammians and the values of the corresponding singular values might also depend on the state-space representation. Carrying on, Question 5 is important for obtaining a deeper theoretical insight and for answering Question 6. Whereas, Question 6 is important, because the reduced system is to be used for control design, which is easier if certain important system-theoretic properties remain valid.

Contribution of the paper

In this paper, we prove the following results:

- We prove the error-bound (4) for continuous and discrete LSSs.
- We show how to estimate the L_2 and l_2 norms using LMIs in such a way that the obtained estimates do not depend on the choice of the state-space representation.
- If a system admits an observability (controllability) grammian, then any minimal linear switched system which describes the same input-output map will admit an observability (controllability) grammian.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between controllability (resp. observability) grammians of minimal systems which describe the same input-output map. This correspondence preserves the singular values. That is, the existence of grammians is a property of the input-output map and not of the state-space representation. For minimal state-space representations, the singular values are functions of the input-output map and not of the state-space representation. We also relate the largest singular value to the Hankel-norm of the system.

As a byproduct, we also show that if an input-output map can be realized by a quadratically stable system[1], then any minimal realization of this map will be quadratically stable.

- For minimal systems, if controllability and observability grammians exist, then they are necessarily strictly positive definite.

  For a class of discrete-time LSS, so called strongly stable LSSs, for which the matrix $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T \otimes A_q^T$ has all its eigenvalues inside the open unit disc, the converse result also holds. Specifically, if nice controllability and observability grammians are positive definite then the system is minimal.

- Balanced truncation preserves quadratic stability. However, it does not necessarily preserve minimality. The fact that balanced truncation does not preserve minimality is a further indication of that the method might be very conservative.

Related work The current paper is an extension of [5]. With respect to this work, the main differences are:

1. The current paper contains detailed proofs.
2. It presents results for both the continuous- and discrete-time LSSs.
3. It provides a detailed exposition of the comparison between balanced truncation of switched systems and balanced truncation of linear parameter - varying systems and systems with structured uncertainty.

---

[1] i.e. a system with a common quadratic Lyapunov function

A rich literature covers the subject of model reduction for switched systems, [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. In particular, balanced truncation was explored in [1, 2, 14, 13, 15, 12, 16]. The procedure dealt with in this paper was already described in [1, 2]. The error bounds of balanced truncation were investigated in [3] for linear parameter varying systems, in [17] for uncertain systems, and in [14] for discrete-time jump linear stochastic systems. The proofs of the error bound in this paper are original and are inspired by similar proofs for time-varying systems [18]; yet, by introducing certain constructions, we show that the results in this paper can be related to the above works. We will present a detailed comparison between the contribution of this paper and [3, 17, 14] in §7. In short, the main differences are as follows. First, this paper deals explicitly with linear switched systems and does so for both discrete-time and continuous-time. As a consequence, the obtained results are less conservative than the ones of [3, 17, 14] when applied to linear switched systems. Second, we address in great detail the independence of balanced truncation from the choice of state-space representation.

The induced L_2 norm for switched systems was introduced and analyzed in [4, 19, 20]. Nonetheless, the focus in those works was not on the invariance of the computed estimates with respect to the choice of the state-space representation, addressed in this paper.

Equivalent formulations of the concept of strong stability were used in [21, 22], but in a completely different setting. In [22] it was also stated that minimization preserves strong stability, but no proof was provided.

We believe that the paper, as a whole, represents a new contribution, although some of the results of this paper have appeared in other contexts in literature. It provides a coherent exposition of the theoretical aspects of balanced truncation, and it does it in a self-contained manner. The presentation is tailored to linear switched systems. Finally, we believe that the relationship between the approach presented in the current work and balanced truncation methods of [3, 17, 14] is also interesting on its own right, since the corresponding system classes are rather far from linear switched systems.

Outline: In §2, we present the formal definition of continuous- and discrete-time LSSs. Furthermore, we give a brief overview of realization theory of LSSs. In §3, we state the formal definition of L_2 and l_2 norms, and grammians. Subsequently, we show the relationship between these concepts and conditions which guarantee their existence. In §4, we show that quadratic stability, estimates of the L_2 and l_2 norms, existence of grammians and the singular values of the system are all independent on the state-space representation. In §5, we discuss the system theoretic interpretation of grammians and their singular values. For the class of strongly stable discrete-time LSS, we show that the balanced truncation conserves strong stability and minimality of the representation. In §6, we present the proof of the error bound for balanced truncation. Finally in §7, we show how our results are related to the results on balanced truncation of uncertain systems, linear parameter varying systems and discrete-time Markov jump linear systems.

Notation: The cardinality of a set S is denoted $|S|$. By $\mathbb{N}$, we denote the set of natural numbers including 0, and by $T = \mathbb{R}_+$ the set of non negative reals. We denote by $||x||_2$ the Euclidean norm of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We denote by $\mathbb{R}^{k \times l}$ the set of all $k \times l$ matrices with real entries. For a symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we write $A > 0$, $A < 0$, $A \geq 0$ and $A \leq 0$ if A is strictly positive definite, strictly negative definite, positive semi-definite and negative semi-definite, respectively. By $\mathrm{diag}(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$, we denote the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, we denote by $\mathrm{diag}(A_1, \ldots, A_k)$ the $n \times n$ block-diagonal matrix, such that $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i$.

We use the standard notation of automata theory [23]. For a set X, called the *alphabet*, we denote by X^* the set of finite strings of elements of X, and by X^ω the set of infinite strings of elements of X. Elements of X^* and X^ω are called finite and infinite words, respectively. That is, a typical element of X^* is a finite sequence $w_0 \cdots w_k$, $w_0, \ldots, w_k \in X$ and a typical element of X^ω is an infinite sequence $w_0 w_1 \cdots$, such that $w_0, w_1, \ldots \in X$.

For a finite word $w = w_0 w_1 \cdots w_k \in X^*$, its length is denoted by $|w|$ and is equal $k+1$. We denote by ϵ the empty sequence (word) in X^*. In addition, we define $X^+ = X^* \setminus \{\epsilon\}$.

We say that a map $f : T \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is *piecewise-continuous*, if f has finitely many points of discontinuity on any compact subinterval of T, and at any point of discontinuity the left-hand and right-hand side limits of f exist and are finite. We denote by $PC(T, \mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of all piecewise-continuous functions of the above form. The notation $AC(T, \mathbb{R}^n)$ designates the set of all absolutely continuous maps $f : T \to \mathbb{R}^n$. We denote by $L_2 = L_2(T, \mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of all Lebesgue measurable maps $f : T \to \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $\int_0^\infty ||f(s)||_2^2 ds < \infty$. For $f \in L_2$, we denote by $||f||_2$ the standard norm of f, i.e., $||f||_2 = \sqrt{\int_0^\infty ||f(s)||_2^2 ds}$. Likewise, we denote by $l_2 = l_2(\mathbb{R}^n) = l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of all sequences $x = (x_0, x_1, \ldots)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with bounded l_2 norm, i.e., $||x||_2 =$

$\sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}||x_i||_2^2} < \infty$. Finally, if M is a $k \times l$ matrix, then $||M||_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm of M, i.e., $||M||_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{j=1}^{l} M_{i,j}^2}$. For M a square matrix, i.e., $k = l$, we denote by $\mathrm{tr}(M)$ the trace of M, $\mathrm{tr}(M) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} M_{i,i}$.

If $z : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^r$ for some r, then denote by $\delta(z)$ the forward shift operator $\delta(z)(t) = z(t+1)$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$. If $z \in AC(T, \mathbb{R}^r)$, then denote by $\delta(z)$ the derivative operator, i.e. $\delta(z)(t) = \frac{dz}{dt}(t)$.

2. Linear switched systems

Below, we formulate the definition of (continuous and discrete) linear switched systems and their system theoretic properties. The presentation is based on [24, 25].

Definition 1 (Linear switched systems)**.** *A* linear switched system *with external switching (abbreviated as LSS) is a tuple*

$$\Sigma = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\}),$$

where $Q = \{1, \ldots, D\}$ *for some fixed* $D \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$*, and for each* $q \in Q$, $(A_q, B_q, C_q) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$*. The number* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*, sometimes denoted* $\dim \Sigma$*, is called the* dimension *of the LSS* Σ*. The elements of the set* Q *will be called the discrete modes, and* Q *will be called the set of discrete modes.*

The phrase "external switching" will be explained after we have introduced the notion of a solution.

In the sequel, we use the following notation and terminology: the state space $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, the output space $Y = \mathbb{R}^p$, and the input space $U = \mathbb{R}^m$. Moreover, to unify notation, we write $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{Q}$, $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ to denote either $L_2(T, U)$, $PC(T, Q)$, $AC(T, X)$ and $PC(T, Y)$ (in continuous-time) or $l_2(U)$, Q^ω, X^ω and Y^ω (in discrete time).

Occasionally, we write $q(t)$ for the tth element q_t of a sequence $q \in Q^\omega$. The same comment applies to the elements of U^ω, X^ω and Y^ω.

With the conventions just stated, we collectively denote by $|| \cdot ||_2$ either the l_2 norm (in discrete-time) or the L_2 norm (in continuous-time).

Definition 2 (Solution)**.** *A* solution *of the switched system (with external switching)* Σ *with initial state* $x_0 \in X$ *and relative to the pair* $(u, q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$ *is by definition a pair* $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ *satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta x(t) &= A_{q(t)}x(t) + B_{q(t)}u(t) \;\; a.e, \;\; x(0) = x_0 \\ y(t) &= C_{q(t)}x(t), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

with a.e meaning almost everywhere and δ denoting the derivative operator in continuous-time, and the forward shift operator in discrete-time.

In both continuous and discrete-time, we shall call u the control input, q the switching signal, x the state trajectory, and y the output trajectory.

Note that the pair $(u, q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$ can be considered as an input to the LSS. The phrase "external input" in the definition of an LSS refers to the fact that (u, q) can be chosen externally. Contrary to the situation when q is state-dependent and the value of q is assigned internally; for instance, when the state space is partitioned and a specific value of q is assigned for each cell of the partition.

In the sequel, we only specify whether we consider continuous or discrete-time when this is not clear from the context. Remarkably, the particular case is frequently immaterial for reaching our conclusions.

Definition 3 (Input-state and input-output maps)**.** *The* input-state *map* $X^{\Sigma}_{x_0}$ *and* input-output *map* $Y^{\Sigma}_{x_0}$ *for the LSS* Σ*, induced by the initial state* $x_0 \in X$*, are the maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q} \to \mathcal{X};\ (u, q) \mapsto X^{\Sigma}_{x_0}(u, q) = x, \\ \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q} \to \mathcal{Y};\ (u, q) \mapsto Y^{\Sigma}_{x_0}(u, q) = y, \end{aligned}$$

where (x, y) *is the solution of* Σ *at* x_0 *relative to* (u, q)*.*

A natural question is when a map f of the form

$$f : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q} \to \mathcal{Y} \tag{6}$$

is indeed realized by an LSS. In the sequel, we refer to a map (6) as an input-output map. To address the above problem, we will fix a designated initial state for LSSs. Since we will mostly deal with exponentially stable LSSs, we will set the initial state to be zero. While this choice seems natural for the current paper, other choices might be more appropriate in other circumstances. Nonetheless, many of the results of this paper can be extended to the case of non-zero initial conditions.

Definition 4 (Realization and equivalence)**.** *The* input-output map Y^{Σ} *of an LSS* Σ *is the input-output map* $Y^{\Sigma} = Y^{\Sigma}_{0}$ *induced by the zero initial state. The LSS* Σ *is said to be a* realization *of an input-output map* f *of the form* (6)*, if* $Y^{\Sigma} = f$*. Moreover, the LSSs* Σ_1 *and* Σ_2 *are* equivalent *if* $Y^{\Sigma_1} = Y^{\Sigma_2}$*.*

It is clear that any LSS is a realization of its own input-output map induced by the zero initial state.

Definition 5 (Minimality)**.** *The LSS* Σ_{m} *is said to be a* minimal *realization of an input-output map* f*, if* Σ_{m} *is a realization of* f *and if for any other LSS* Σ *which is a realization of* f*,* $\dim \Sigma_{\mathrm{m}} \leq \dim \Sigma$*. We say that* Σ_{m} *is a minimal LSS , if it is a minimal realization of its input-output map* $Y^{\Sigma_{\mathrm{m}}}$*.*

Definition 6 (Observability)**.** *An LSS* Σ *is said to be* observable*, if for any two states* $x_1 \neq x_2 \in X$*, the input-output maps induced by* x_1 *and* x_2 *are different, i.e.,* $Y^{\Sigma}_{x_1} \neq Y^{\Sigma}_{x_2}$*.*

Let $\mathit{Reach}_{x_0}(\Sigma) \subseteq X$ denote the reachable set of the LSS Σ relative to the initial condition $x_0 \in X$, i.e., $\mathit{Reach}_{x_0}(\Sigma)$ is the image of the map $(u, q, t) \mapsto X^{\Sigma}_{x_0}(u, q)(t)$.

Definition 7 ((Span-)Reachability)**.** *The LSS* Σ *is said to be* reachable *if every state is reachable from the zero initial state, i.e., if* $\mathit{Reach}_0(\Sigma) = X$*. The LSS* Σ *is* span-reachable *if* X *is the smallest vector space containing* $\mathit{Reach}(\Sigma)$*.*

We note that span-reachability and reachability are the same in continuous-time.

As we now recall (in Theorem 1 below), there is a strong relation between minimality on one side and span-reachability and observability on the other.

Definition 8. *(Isomorphism) Two LSS*

$$\Sigma_1 = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\}),$$

and

$$\Sigma_2 = (n, Q, \{(A^a_q, B^a_q, C^a_q) \mid q \in Q\})$$

are said to be isomorphic *if there exists a non-singular matrix* $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ *such that*

$$\forall q \in Q : A^a_q S = S A_q, B^a_q = S B_q, C^a_q S = C_q.$$

The matrix S *is said to be an* isomorphism *from* Σ_1 *to* Σ_2 *and is denoted by* $S : \Sigma_1 \to \Sigma_2$*.*

The following theorem summaries various results on minimality, see [26, 27, 24].

Theorem 1 (Minimality)**.** *A LSS realization is minimal, if and only if it is span-reachable and observable. All minimal LSS realizations of an input-output map are isomorphic. Finally, if* Σ_1 *and* Σ_2 *are two equivalent and minimal LSSs, then they are related by an LSS isomorphism.*

Remark 1. *In [24, 26, 27] a slightly different definition of input-output maps was used. There, an input-output map* Y_{Σ,x_0} *of* Σ *induced by the initial state* x_0 *was a map of the form* $Y_{\Sigma,x_0} : PC(T,U) \times (Q \times T)^+ \to Y$ *for the continuous-time case and* $Y_{\Sigma,x_0} : (U \times Q)^+ \to Y$ *for the discrete-time case. The relationship between* Y_{Σ,x_0} *and* $Y^{\Sigma}_{x_0}$ *is as follows.*

For the continuous-time case, consider a sequence $w = (q_1,t_1)\cdots(q_k,t_k) \in (Q \times T)^+$*. The interpretation of* w *is as follows: the discrete mode* q_i *is active for duration* t_i*. Assume that* w *has the property that there exists no* $i = 1,\dots,k-1$ *such that* $t_i = t_{i+1} = 0$*. It is clear from [24, 27] that* Y_{Σ,x_0} *is uniquely determined by its restriction to the switching sequences satisfying this property. Any such switching sequence can be interpreted as a restriction of a signal* $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ *to the interval* $[0, \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i]$ *such that* $q|_{(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j, \sum_{j=1}^{i} t_j]} = q_i$, $q(0) = q_0$, $i = 1,\dots,k$*. Conversely, for any signal* $q \in Q$*, the restriction of* q *to a finite time interval can be interpreted as such a switching sequence. From the definition of* Y_{Σ,x_0} *presented in [24, 27], it follows that* $Y_{\Sigma,x_0}(u,w)$ *depends only on the restriction of* u *to* $[0, \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i]$*. It is easy to see that for any* $u \in PC(T,U)$*, there exists a* $\widetilde{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ *such that on* $[0, \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i]$ u *and* $\widetilde{u}$ *coincide. As a consequence,* $Y_{\Sigma,x_0}(u,w) = Y^{\Sigma}_{x_0}(\widetilde{u},q)(\sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i)$*. Hence, there is a one-to-one correspondence between* Y_{Σ,x_0} *and* $Y^{\Sigma}_{x_0}$*.*

For the discrete-time case, $Y_{\Sigma,x_0}((u_0,q_0)\cdots(u_t,q_t)) = Y^{\Sigma}_{x_0}(\widetilde{u},q)(t)$*, where* $(\widetilde{u},v)$ *is any element of* $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$ *such that* $\widetilde{u}(i) = u_i$ *and* $v_i = q_i$ *for all* $i = 0,\dots,t$*. Since any element of* $(U \times Q)^+$ *arises from some element of* $\mathcal{U} \times Q$ *in this way, it follows that there is one-to-one correspondence between* Y_{Σ,x_0} *and* $Y^{\Sigma}_{x_0}$*.*

It then follows that two LSSs Σ_1 *and* Σ_2 *are equivalent according to Definition 4 if and only if* $Y_{\Sigma_1,0} = Y_{\Sigma_2,0}$*, i.e.* Σ_1 *and* Σ_2 *realize the same input-output map according to [24, 26, 27]. From the discussion above, it is also easy to see that the definitions of observability and span-reachability and minimality presented above coincide with those in [24, 26, 27]. This means that the results of [24, 26, 27] on minimal realization can indeed be used, despite the slight difference in the definition of input-output maps.*

Remark 2. *Note that it is also possible to extend the notion of a Hankel-*

matrix to switched systems (see §5.2) and show that existence of a realization is equivalent to the finiteness of the rank of the Hankel-matrix. In fact, the rank of the Hankel-matrix will give the dimension of a minimal realization. For the purposes of this paper these results are not directly relevant, the interested reader is referred to [24, 26, 27].

Observability and span-reachability of an LSS can be characterized by linear-algebraic conditions. To present these conditions, we introduce the following notation.

Notation 1. *Consider an LSS* $\Sigma = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\})$. *For a sequence* $q \in Q^*$, *we write*

$$A_q = \begin{cases} I_n & \textit{if } q = \epsilon, \\ A_{q_k} \cdots A_{q_2} A_{q_1} & \textit{if } q = q_1 q_2 \cdots q_k, \end{cases}$$

where I_n *denotes the* $n \times n$ *identity matrix; and recall that* ϵ *is the empty sequence.*

Let Q_n^* be the set of all words $w \in Q^*$ of length at most n,

$$Q_n^* = \{w \in Q^* \mid |w| \le n\}.$$

Furthermore, denote by M the cardinality of Q_n^* ($M = |Q_n^*|$). Fix an ordering $\{v_1, \ldots, v_M\}$ of the set Q_n^*. The next theorem is due to [28, 25, 26].

Theorem 2.
Span-Reachability: *The LSS* Σ *is span-reachable if and only if* $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{R}(\Sigma) = n$, *where*

$$\mathcal{R}(\Sigma) = \begin{bmatrix} A_{v_1}\widetilde{B}, & A_{v_2}\widetilde{B}, & \ldots, & A_{v_M}\widetilde{B} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times mDM}$$

with $\widetilde{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1, & B_2, & \ldots, & B_D \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times Dm}$.

Observability: *The LSS* Σ *is observable if and only if* $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{O}(\Sigma) = n$, *where*

$$\mathcal{O}(\Sigma) = \begin{bmatrix} (\widetilde{C}A_{v_1})^T, & (\widetilde{C}A_{v_2})^T, & \ldots, & (\widetilde{C}A_{v_M})^T \end{bmatrix}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{pDM \times n}.$$

where $\widetilde{C} = \begin{bmatrix} C_1^T & C_2^T, & \ldots, & C_D^T \end{bmatrix}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{pD \times n}$.

The matrix $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}(\Sigma)$) will be called a *span-reachability matrix* (resp. *observability matrix*) of Σ.

Remark 3. *If a linear subsystem of an LSS Σ is observable (reachable), then Σ is observable (resp. span-reachable). Hence, by Theorem 1, if a linear subsystem of Σ is minimal, then Σ itself is minimal.*

Remark 4. *In [28, 25, 26] it is shown that* $\ker \mathcal{O}(\Sigma) = \bigcap_{q \in Q, v \in Q^*} \ker C_q A_v$ *and* $\mathrm{Im}\ \mathcal{R}(\Sigma) = \mathrm{Span}\{A_v B_q u \mid v \in Q^*, q \in Q, u \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$.

Remark 5. *Note that observability (span-reachability) of an LSS does not imply observability (reachability) of any of its linear subsystems. In fact, it is easy to construct a counter example [24]. Together with Theorem 1, which states that minimal realizations are unique up to isomorphism, this implies that* there exists an input-output map which can be realized by an LSS, but which cannot be realized by an LSS where all (or some) of the linear subsystems are observable (or reachable).

Remark 6 (Duality between span-reachability and observability)**.** *If* $\Sigma = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\})$, *then define the* dual system of Σ *as* $\Sigma^T = (n, Q, \{(A_q^T, C_q^T, B_q^T) \mid q \in Q\})$. *From Theorem 2 it then follows that Σ is observable if and only if Σ^T is span-reachable. Conversely, Σ is span-reachable, if and only if Σ^T is observable. That is, similarly to linear systems, reachability and observability are dual properties for LSSs.*

From [24, 25, 26], we have the following algorithms for reachability and observability reduction, and minimal representation.

Procedure 1.
Reachability reduction*: Assume that* $\mathrm{rank}\ \mathcal{R}(\Sigma) = r$ *and choose a basis* $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ *of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *such that* $b_1, \ldots, b_r$ *span* $\mathrm{Im}\ \mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$. *In the new basis, the matrices* A_q, B_q, C_q, $q \in Q$ *become as follows*

$$A_q = \begin{bmatrix} A_q^{\mathrm{R}} & A_q' \\ 0 & A_q'' \end{bmatrix}, C_q = \begin{bmatrix} C_q^{\mathrm{R}}, & C_q' \end{bmatrix}, B_q = \begin{bmatrix} B_q^{\mathrm{R}} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

where $A_q^{\mathrm{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}, B_q^{\mathrm{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times m}$, *and* $C_q^{\mathrm{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$. *As a consequence,* $\Sigma^{\mathrm{R}} = (r, Q, \{(A_q^{\mathrm{R}}, B_q^{\mathrm{R}}, C_q^{\mathrm{R}}) \mid q \in Q\})$ *is span-reachable, and has the same input-output map as* Σ.

Intuitively, Σ^{R} is obtained from Σ by restricting the dynamics and the output map of Σ to the subspace $\mathrm{Im}\ \mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$.

Procedure 2.

Observability reduction: *Assume that* $\ker \mathcal{O}(\Sigma) = n - o$, *and let* $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ *be a basis in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *such that* $b_{o+1}, \ldots, b_n$ *span* $\ker \mathcal{O}(\Sigma)$. *In this new basis,* A_q, B_q, *and* C_q *can be rewritten as*

$$A_q = \begin{bmatrix} A_q^{\mathrm{O}} & 0 \\ A_q^{'} & A_q^{''} \end{bmatrix}, C_q = \begin{bmatrix} C_q^{\mathrm{O}}, & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B_q = \begin{bmatrix} B_q^{\mathrm{O}} \\ B_q^{'} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $A_q^{\mathrm{O}} \in \mathbb{R}^{o \times o}, B_q^{\mathrm{O}} \in \mathbb{R}^{o \times m}$, *and* $C_q^{\mathrm{O}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times o}$. *Consequently, the LSS* $\Sigma^{\mathrm{O}} = (o, Q, \{(A_q^{\mathrm{O}}, B_q^{\mathrm{O}}, C_q^{\mathrm{O}}) \mid q \in Q\})$ *is observable and its input-output map is the same as that of* Σ. *If* Σ *is span-reachable, then so is* Σ^{O}.

Intuitively, Σ^{O} is obtained from Σ by merging any two states x_1, x_2 of Σ, for which $\mathcal{O}(\Sigma)x_1 = \mathcal{O}(\Sigma)x_2$.

Procedure 3.

Minimal representation:

Transform Σ *to a reachable LSS* Σ^{R} *by Procedure 1. Subsequently, transform* Σ^{R} *to an observable LSS* $\Sigma^{\mathrm{M}} = (\Sigma^{\mathrm{R}})^{\mathrm{O}}$ *using Procedure 2. Then* Σ^{M} *is a minimal LSS which is equivalent to* Σ.

3. Stability, grammians and $\mathcal{L}_2$ norms

In this section, we briefly review the definition of controllability/observability grammians, $\mathcal{L}_2$ norm, and quadratic stability for LSSs. We also recall the basic relationships between these concepts.

Definition 9 (Quadratic stability)**.** *An LSS*

$$\Sigma = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\})$$

is said to be quadratically stable if there exists a positive definite matrix $P > 0$ *such that*

$$\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{S}(q, \Sigma, P) < 0, \tag{8a}$$

where

- *in continuous-time (Lyapunov equation)*

$$\mathbf{S}(q, \Sigma, P) = A_q^T P + P A_q, \tag{8b}$$

- *in discrete-time (Stein equation)*

$$\mathbf{S}(q, \Sigma, P) = A_q^T P A_q - P. \tag{8c}$$

It is well-known [29] that quadratic stability implies exponential stability for all switching signals. For our purposes quadratic stability is convenient, as it implies the existence of an $\mathcal{L}_2$ gain (Definition 11) and controllability/observability grammians.

Definition 10. *(*Controllability/observability grammians*)*
An observability grammian *of Σ is a positive definite solution $\mathscr{Q} > 0$ of the following inequality*

$$\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) \leq 0, \tag{9a}$$

where

- *in continuous-time*

$$\mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) = A_q^T \mathscr{Q} + \mathscr{Q} A_q + C_q^T C_q, \tag{9b}$$

- *in discrete-time*

$$\mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) = A_q^T \mathscr{Q} A_q + C_q^T C_q - \mathscr{Q}. \tag{9c}$$

A controllability grammian *of Σ is a positive definite solution $\mathcal{P} > 0$ of the following inequality*

$$\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) \leq 0, \tag{10a}$$

where

- *in continuous-time*

$$\mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) = A_q \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{P} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T, \tag{10b}$$

- *in discrete-time*

$$\mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) = A_q \mathcal{P} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T - \mathcal{P}. \tag{10c}$$

We will call the eigenvalues of the product $\mathcal{P}\mathscr{Q}$ the singular values *of the pair of grammians $(\mathcal{P}, \mathscr{Q})$.*

Existence of a controllability or observability grammian does not imply quadratic stability. However, if in (10a) or (9a) we replace inequality by strict inequality, then existence of a positive definite solution to the thus obtaines LMIs is equivalent to quadratic stability. More precisely, using techniques from [30], one can show that

Lemma 1. *The following are equivalent:*

- ***(i)*** *Σ is quadratically stable,*
- ***(ii)*** *there exists $\mathscr{Q} > 0$ such that $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) < 0$,*
- ***(iii)*** *there exists $\mathcal{P} > 0$ such that $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) < 0$,*

The proof of Lemma 1 can be found in Appendix B.

Note that existence of controllability grammian does not imply controllability, even if $|Q| = 1$, i.e. we have the classical linear case. For a counter-example for the linear case, see [17].

To define the $\mathcal{L}_2$ norm for an LSS , we recall that $||\cdot||_2$ denotes either the l_2 norm (in discrete-time) or the L_2 norm (in continuous-time).

Definition 11 ([4])**.** *We say that Y^{Σ} has an $\mathcal{L}_2$ gain $\gamma > 0$ if*

a) $Y^{\Sigma}(u, q)$ belongs to $L_2(T, Y)$ (in continuous time case) or to $l_2(Y)$ (in discrete time case) for all $(u, q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$, and

b)

$$\sup_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} ||Y^{\Sigma}(u, q)||_2 \leq \gamma ||u||_2 \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}. \tag{11}$$

If Y^{Σ} has an $\mathcal{L}_2$ gain, then we define the $\mathcal{L}_2$ norm of Y^{Σ}, denoted by $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, as the infimum of all $\gamma > 0$ such that (11) holds. If Y^{Σ} does not have an $\mathcal{L}_2$ gain, then we set $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} = +\infty$.

Note that existence of a $\mathcal{L}_2$ gain of Y^{Σ} means that the outputs of Σ belong to $L_2(T, Y)$ (cont. time) or $l_2(Y)$ (disc. time) respectively. We note that since $u \mapsto Y^{\Sigma}(u, q)$ is linear for each q, the $\mathcal{L}_2$ norm of Y^{Σ} can equivalently be defined as

$$||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \sup_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \sup_{||u||_2 = 1} ||Y^{\Sigma}(u, q)||_2,$$

whenever $||Y^{\Sigma}(u,q)||_2$ exists. In other words, $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ is the supremum of the operator norms

$$||Y^{\Sigma}(\cdot,q)|| = \sup_{||u||_2=1} ||Y^{\Sigma}(u,q)||_2.$$

Lemma 2. *If Σ is quadratically stable, then (12) below has a positive definite solution P.*

$$\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{G}_{\gamma}(q,\Sigma,P) < 0, \tag{12a}$$

where

- *in continuous time*

$$\mathbf{G}_{\gamma}(q,\Sigma,P) = \begin{bmatrix} A_q^T P + P A_q + C_q^T C_q & P B_q \\ B_q^T P & -\gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix}, \tag{12b}$$

- *in discrete time*

$$\mathbf{G}_{\gamma}(q,\Sigma,P) = \begin{bmatrix} A_q^T P A_q + C_q^T C_q - P, & A_q^T P B_q \\ B_q^T P A_q, & B_q^T P B_q - \gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix}. \tag{12c}$$

If a positive definite solution to (12) exists, then for any $(u,q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$, $||Y^{\Sigma}(u,q)||_2$ is defined and $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \gamma$.

The proof of Lemma 2 can be found in Appendix C.

4. Invariance of state-space representation

In the previous section, we defined quadratic stability, $\mathcal{L}_2$ gains, and grammians. The concepts were defined in terms of LMIs. We will show that the existence of a solution to those LMIs is a property of the input-output map. Furthermore, for equivalent minimal systems, the set of solutions are isomorphic. In order to formalize this result, we will introduce the following notation.

Definition 12. *For a LSS*

$$\Sigma = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\}),$$

define the following subsets of the set of $n \times n$ strictly positive definite matrices

- $\mathbf{S}(\Sigma)$ *is the "stability" set of all* $P>0$ *which satisfy* (8).
- $\mathbf{O}(\Sigma)$ *is the "observability" set of all* $\mathscr{Q}>0$ *for which* (9) *holds.*
- $\mathbf{C}(\Sigma)$ *is the "controllability" set of all* $\mathcal{P}>0$ *for which* (10) *holds.*
- *For* $\gamma>0$, *let* $\mathbf{G}_\gamma(\Sigma)$ *be the set of all* $P>0$ *which satisfy* (12).

Now, we can state the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let* $\mathbf{K}$ *be any symbol from* $\{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{O},\mathbf{C},\mathbf{G}_\gamma\}$.

1. *If the LSS* Σ *is such that* $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma)\neq\emptyset$, *then for any minimal LSS* Σ_{m} *which is equivalent to* Σ, $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{m}})\neq\emptyset$.
2. *If* $\mathcal{P}\in\mathbf{C}(\Sigma)$, $\mathscr{Q}\in\mathbf{O}(\Sigma)$, *then for any minimal LSS* Σ_m *which is equivalent to* Σ, *there exist* $\mathcal{P}_m\in\mathbf{C}(\Sigma_m)$ *and* $\mathscr{Q}_m\in\mathbf{O}(\Sigma_m)$, *such that the following holds: if* $\sigma_1\geq,\dots,\geq\sigma_n$ *are the singular values of* $(\mathcal{P},\mathscr{Q})$ *and* $\lambda_1\geq,\dots,\geq\lambda_k$ *are the singular values of* $(\mathcal{P}_m,\mathscr{Q}_m)$, *then* $\sigma_{n-k+i}\leq\lambda_i\leq\sigma_i$, $i=1,\dots,k$, $k=\dim\Sigma_m$.
3. *Let* Σ_1 *and* Σ_2 *be two LSSs of dimension* n *and let* $\mathcal{S}:\Sigma_1\to\Sigma_2$ *be an isomorphism between them. If* $\mathbf{K}\in\{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{O},\mathbf{G}_\gamma\}$ *then define* $M=\mathcal{S}^{-1}\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$; *if* $\mathbf{K}=\mathbf{C}$, *then define* $M=\mathcal{S}^T$. *Then*

$$P\in\mathbf{K}(\Sigma_1)\iff M^TPM\in\mathbf{K}(\Sigma_2). \tag{13}$$

   In particular, for any two minimal and equivalent LSSs Σ_1 *and* Σ_2, *there exists a non singular matrix* M *such that* (13) *holds.*

The theorem above expresses that quadratic stability and existence of controllability/observability grammians are preserved by minimality. In fact, if one of these properties holds for a state-space representation, then it holds for any minimal state-space representation. From Theorem 3 it follows that it is sufficient to perform balanced truncation on minimal systems. This will be explained in detail in Remark 9.

Corollary 1. *For minimal LSSs, the singular values of grammians do not depend on the choice of state-space representation. Indeed, assume that* Σ_1 *is a minimal LSS, and consider the singular values* $\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_n$ *for a choice of grammians* $(\mathcal{P}_1,\mathscr{Q}_1)$ *of* Σ_1. *Then for any minimal LSS* Σ_2 *which is equivalent to* Σ_1 *there exists a pair of grammians* $(\mathcal{P}_2,\mathscr{Q}_2)$ *of* Σ_2 *such that the singular values of* $(\mathcal{P}_2,\mathscr{Q}_2)$ *are also* $\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_n$.

For an LSS Σ, define $\gamma(\Sigma) = \inf\{\gamma > 0 \mid \mathbf{G}_\gamma(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset\}$. Then clearly the $\mathcal{L}_2$ norm of the input-output map of Σ is at most $\gamma(\Sigma)$. From Theorem 3, we obtain that

Corollary 2.

- *For any minimal LSS Σ_m which is equivalent to Σ, $\gamma(\Sigma_m) \leq \gamma(\Sigma)$.*
- *If Σ_i, $i = 1, 2$, are two minimal and equivalent LSSs, then $\gamma(\Sigma_1) = \gamma(\Sigma_2)$.*

As a consequence, the number $\gamma(\Sigma)$, where Σ is minimal, depends only on the input-output map of Y^Σ. Note that $\gamma(\Sigma)$ can be computed by solving a classical optimization problem.

Proof of Theorem 3. The proof for both the discrete- and the continuous-time case are the same, hence we present both cases together.

The proof of the last part of the theorem follows by an easy computation and by recalling that if Σ_1 and Σ_2 are two equivalent and minimal LSSs, then they are related by an LSS isomorphism.

Next, we prove the first statement of the theorem. In order to make the proof easier, we denote by $\hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma)$ the set of all inverses of elements of $\mathbf{C}(\Sigma)$. Clearly, showing that $\hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \implies \hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{m}}) \neq \emptyset$ is equivalent to showing $\hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \implies \hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{m}}) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, in the sequel, we will show that $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbf{K}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{m}}) \neq \emptyset$ for $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{S}, \hat{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{O}, \mathbf{G}_\gamma\}$. To this end, it is enough to show that if $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset$ and we apply Procedures 1–2 to obtain a minimal LSS Σ_{m}, then $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{m}}) \neq \emptyset$.

First, we show that the application of Procedure 1 preserves the non-emptiness of $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma)$. Recall the partitioning of A_q from (7) and consider the corresponding partitioning of P

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{21} & P_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

A simple computation reveals that

Lemma 3. *If $P \in \mathbf{K}(\Sigma)$, then $P_{11} \in \mathbf{K}(\Sigma_r)$ for $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{G}_\gamma, \mathbf{O}, \hat{\mathbf{C}}\}$.*

The proof of Lemma 3 can be found in Appendix D.

Next, we show that Procedure 2 preserves non-emptiness of $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma)$. We will use the duality between observability and reachability, explained in Remark 6. Define the dual system $\Sigma^T = (n, Q, \{(A_q^T, C_q^T, B_q^T) \mid q \in Q\})$. The following properties of the dual system Σ^T hold.

Lemma 4.

1. *For* $P \in \mathbf{S}(\Sigma) \iff P^{-1} \in \mathbf{S}(\Sigma^T)$,
2. $P \in \mathbf{O}(\Sigma) \iff P^{-1} \in \hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma^T)$ *and* $P \in \hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma) \iff P^{-1} \in \mathbf{O}(\Sigma^T)$.
3. $P \in \mathbf{G}_\gamma(\Sigma) \iff \gamma^2 P^{-1} \in \mathbf{G}_\gamma(\Sigma^T)$.

The proof of Lemma 4 can be found in Appendix E.

As a consequence, $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma^T) \neq \emptyset$ for $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{G}_\gamma\}$, and $\mathbf{O}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \implies \hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma^T) \neq \emptyset$, and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbf{O}(\Sigma^T) \neq \emptyset$. From the definition of duality it follows that if Σ_{rt} is the result of applying Procedure 1 to Σ^T, then $\Sigma_{\mathrm{rt}}^T = \Sigma_{\mathrm{o}}$, where Σ_{o} is the result of application of Procedure 2 to Σ. Since Procedure 1 preserves non-emptiness of $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma^T)$, $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{G}_\gamma, \mathbf{O}, \hat{\mathbf{C}}\}$, we have that $\mathbf{K}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbf{K}(\Sigma^T) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbf{K}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{rt}}) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbf{K}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{o}}) \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{G}_\gamma\}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbf{O}(\Sigma^T) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbf{O}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{rt}}) \neq \emptyset \implies \hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{o}}) \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{O}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \implies \hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma^T) \neq \emptyset \implies \hat{\mathbf{C}}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{rt}}) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathbf{O}(\Sigma_{\mathrm{o}}) \neq \emptyset$.

Finally, we show the second statement. Without loss of generality, we can assume that Σ_m is the result of applying Procedure 1 and Procedure 2 to Σ. Consider a matrix pair $(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}')$, $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$, $\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}' \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}' > 0$. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q}$ and let $\lambda_1' \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_k'$ be the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}'\mathcal{Q}'$. We write $(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}') \preceq (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$, if $k \leq n$ and $\lambda_{n-k+i} \leq \lambda_i' \leq \lambda_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$. It is easy to see that $\preceq$ is a transitive relation. Hence, it is enough to show that if we apply Procedure 1 or Procedure 2 to Σ, then the resulting system will have a pair of controllability and observability grammians $(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}')$, such that $(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}') \preceq (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$. From Lemma 4 it follows that it is enough to prove this only for Procedure 1.

Let P_{11} and $\mathcal{Q}_{11}$ be the upper left $r \times r$ sub-matrices of $P = \mathcal{P}^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ in the basis described in Procedure 1. Then Lemma 3 implies that $P_{11}^{-1} \in \mathbf{C}(\Sigma_r)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{11} \in \mathbf{O}(\Sigma_r)$. We claim that $(P_{11}^{-1}, \mathcal{Q}_{11}) \preceq (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$. Indeed, notice that the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q}$ and $P_{11}^{-1}\mathcal{Q}_{11}$ are exactly the characteristic values of the regular matrix pencils $(\mathcal{Q} - \lambda \mathcal{P}^{-1})$ and $(\mathcal{Q}_{11} - \lambda P_{11})$ respectively, see [31, Chapter X.§6]. But $(\mathcal{Q}_{11} - \lambda P_{11})$ is just the pencil $(\mathcal{Q} - \lambda \mathcal{P}^{-1})$ with $n - r$ independent linear constraints which describe the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Sigma)$. Then from [31, Chapter X.§7, Theorem 14], it follows that $(P_{11}^{-1}, \mathcal{Q}_{11}) \preceq (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$. $\square$

5. System-theoretic interpretation of grammians and their singular values

In this section, we provide a system theoretic interpretation of grammians and their singular value. To this end, we link them to observability, span-reachability and Hankel-norms.

Theorem 4. *If $\mathcal{P}$ be a positive semi-definite matrix which satisfies* (9a) *and Σ is span-reachable, then $\mathcal{P}$ is positive definite. Similarly, if $\mathscr{Q}$ is a positive semi-definite matrix which satisfies* (10a) *and Σ is observable, then $\mathscr{Q}$ is positive definite.*

The proof of Theorem 4 is based on the following results, which are interesting on their own right.

Lemma 5. *Assume that $\mathscr{Q} \geq 0$ satisfies $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) \leq 0$. Then for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, $t > 0$*

$$x^T \mathscr{Q} x \geq \begin{cases} \int_0^t ||Y_x^\Sigma(0,q)(s)||_2^2 ds & \textit{(cont.)} \\ \sum_{s=0}^t ||Y_x^\Sigma(0,q)(s)||_2^2 & \textit{(disc.)} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 6. *Assume that $\mathcal{P} > 0$ is a solution to $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) \leq 0$. Then for all $(u, q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$, and $t > 0$*

$$x^T \mathcal{P}^{-1} x \leq \begin{cases} \int_0^t ||u(s)||_2^2 ds \\ \sum_{k=0}^t ||u_k||_2^2 \end{cases},$$

where $x = X_0^\Sigma(u, q)(t)$.

The proofs of Lemma 5 and 6 can be found in Appendix F and Appendix G.

Proof of Theorem 4. We prove the statement for the observability by contradiction. Assume that there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x^T \mathscr{Q} x = 0$. By Lemma 5, this implies that for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, the map $Y_x^\Sigma(0, q) = 0$ and thus $Y_x^\Sigma(0, q) = Y_0^\Sigma(0, q)$ for all q. Note that $Y_x^\Sigma(u, q) = Y_x^\Sigma(0, q) + Y_0^\Sigma(u, q)$, and hence we get that $Y_x^\Sigma(u, q) = Y_0^\Sigma(u, q)$ for all q and u, which contradicts the observability of Σ.

The statement for controllability grammian follows by duality. $\square$

Notice that an LSS may fail to be observable (resp. reachable), even if (9) (resp. (10)) has a positive definite solution, see Example 1 of Section 6. This is due to the fact that in (9) and (10), we require inequalities instead of equalities.

As we shall see in Section 6, a side effect of this phenomenon is that the reduced order model obtained by balanced truncation may fail to be minimal.

As a consequence, one is tempted to ask the question what happens if in (9) (resp. in (10)), we require that for some or for all $q \in Q$, $A_q^T \mathscr{Q} + \mathscr{Q} A_q + C_q^T C_q = 0$ (resp. $\mathcal{P} A_q^T + A_q \mathcal{P} + B_q B_q^T = 0$) holds with equality. In this case, the existence of a strictly positive definite solution to the equations will imply observability (resp. controllability) of some (or all) linear subsystems. However, in Remark 5, we have already explained that for a large class of input-output maps, including those which are realizable by quadratically stable LSSs, there exist no state-space representation such that the local linear subsystems are reachable or observable. Hence, by replacing inequalities by equalities we necessarily restrict applicability of the model reduction approach.

5.1. Nice grammians

As it was mentioned before, existence of a strictly positive definite controllability and observability grammian does not imply span-reachability and observability. In fact, there might exist many grammians, and it is not clear which one of them should be chosen. In discrete time, the problem above can partially be circumvented, by using what we will call *nice grammians*. Nice grammians are special cases of grammians which have the property that they are unique and their existence is equivalent to observability and controllability of the system. Their disadvantage is that they are not preserved by balanced truncation. However, they are potentially interesting for computational purposes and as canonical forms in system identification, and for this reason we discuss them here.

For the formal definition, we introduce the following terminology.

Definition 13 (Strong stability)**.** *We call the LSS Σ* strongly stable*, if the matrix $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T \otimes A_q^T$ is a stable matrix (all its eigenvalues lie inside the unit disc).*

From [32], we obtain the following result.

Lemma 7. *Consider $n \times n$ matrices F_q, $q \in Q$. If $\sum_{q\in Q} F_q^T \otimes F_q^T$ is a stable matrix, then the equation*

$$P = (\sum_{q\in Q} F_q^T P F_q) + \mathcal{G}$$

has a positive semi-definite solution $P \geq 0$ for all positive semi-definite $\mathcal{G} \geq 0$. In fact, this solution is unique and

$$P = \sum_{w\in Q^*} F_w^T \mathcal{G} F_w.$$

Conversely, if the inequality

$$P - (\sum_{q\in Q} F_q^T P F_q) > 0$$

has a positive definite solution, then $\sum_{q\in Q} F_q^T \otimes F_q^T$ is a stable matrix.

The proof of Lemma 7 can be found in Appendix H. Just like quadratic stability, strong stability is preserved by minimization.

Lemma 8. *If Σ is strongly stable and Σ_m is a minimal LSS which is equivalent to Σ, then Σ_m is strongly stable too.*

The proof of Lemma 8 can be found in Appendix I. With the above discussion in mind, we define the concept of *nice grammians.*

Definition 14. *Assume that Σ is strongly stable. Then the unique positive semi-definite solutions $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathscr{Q}$ to*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \sum_{q\in Q} A_q \mathcal{P} A_q^T + \sum_{q\in Q} B_q B_q^T \\ \mathscr{Q} &= \sum_{q\in Q} A_q^T \mathscr{Q} A_q + \sum_{q\in Q} C_q^T C_q \end{aligned}$$

are called nice controllability *and* nice observability *grammians, respectively.*

Notice that $A_q \mathcal{P} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T \leq \sum_{\sigma\in Q} A_\sigma \mathcal{P} A_\sigma^T + B_\sigma B_\sigma^T$ and $A_q^T \mathscr{Q} A_q^T + C_q^T C_q \leq \sum_{\sigma\in Q} A_\sigma^T \mathscr{Q} A_\sigma + C_\sigma^T C_\sigma$. Hence, nice grammians are indeed grammians, since they satisfy (10) and (9) respectively.

Lemma 9. *If Σ is strongly stable, then the nice controllability and observability grammians exists and they are unique.*

The proof of Lemma 9 can be found in Appendix J.

Lemma 10. *Σ is span-reachable if and only if the nice controllability grammian $\mathcal{P}$ is strictly positive definite. Σ is observable if and only if the nice observability grammian is strictly positive definite.*

Proof of Lemma 10. We prove the statement about observability, its counterpart on span-reachability follows by duality. From Lemma 7, it follows that

$$x^T \mathcal{Q} x = \sum_{v \in Q^*} x^T A_v^T \widetilde{C}^T \widetilde{C} A_v x = \sum_{v \in Q^*} ||\widetilde{C} A_v x||_2^2$$

where $\widetilde{C} = \begin{bmatrix} C_1^T, & \dots, & C_D^T \end{bmatrix}^T$. Then it follows that $x^T \mathcal{Q} x = 0$ is equivalent to $C_q A_v x = 0$ for all $q \in Q$, $v \in Q^*$. By Remark 4 the latter is equivalent to $x \in \ker \mathcal{O}(\Sigma)$. From this the statement of the lemma follows by using Theorem 2 and Remark 4. $\square$

To sum up, if Σ is a strongly stable system, then the minimization procedure Procedure 3 preserves strong stability. Moreover, if Σ and $\hat{\Sigma}$ are two isomorphic systems related by an isomorphism $\mathcal{S}$ from Σ to $\hat{\Sigma}$, and if $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are the nice grammians of Σ, then $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}^T$ and $\mathcal{S}^{-T}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}^{-1}$ are the nice controllability and observability grammians of $\hat{\Sigma}$. In other words, the singular values of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q}$ are independent of the choice of the particular minimal realization, and existence of strictly positive definite nice observability and controllability grammians is guaranteed in minimal systems.

5.2. Singular values

We present the interpretation of the largest singular value of a grammian pair $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})$ in terms of the Hankel-norm of the input-output map.

Definition 15 (Hankel-norm)**.** *Let Σ be a quadratically stable LSS and define the* Hankel-norm $||Y^{\Sigma}||_H$ *as follows. Denote by $\mathcal{U}^0$ the set of all inputs $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that there exists a time instant t ($t \in T$ in continuous-time, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ for discrete time), such that $u(s) = 0$ for all $s > t$. Let $\mathbf{HG}(\Sigma)$ be the set of all $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{U}^0, q \in \mathcal{Q} : ||Y^{\Sigma}(u,q)||_2 \leq \gamma ||u||_2,$$

Define the Hankel-norm $||Y^{\Sigma}||_H$ of Y^{Σ} as $||Y^{\Sigma}||_H = \inf \mathbf{HG}(\Sigma)$.

Remark 7. *If Σ is quadratically stable, then by Lemma 2, Y^{Σ} has a finite $\mathcal{L}_2$ norm and the L_2 (or in discrete-time case l_2) norm $||Y^{\Sigma}(u,q)||_2$ exists and it is finite. From the definition of $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ it follows that $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \in \mathbf{HG}(\Sigma)$ and hence $||Y^{\Sigma}||_H \leq ||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2}$.*

Intuitively, the Hankel-norm of Y^{Σ} corresponds to the maximum output energy of the system, if we first feed in a continuous input u with unit energy and from some time t we stop feeding in continuous input and we let the system to develop autonomously.

Theorem 5. *Consider an LSS Σ. Assume that $\mathcal{P} > 0$ is a controllability grammian and $\mathscr{Q} > 0$ is an observability grammian of Σ. The largest singular value σ_{max} of $(\mathcal{P}, \mathscr{Q})$ satisfies*

$$||Y^{\Sigma}||_H \leq \sigma_{max}.$$

Proof of Theorem 5. Pick a switching signal and input $(q,u) \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{U}$ such that for some time instance t that $u(s) = 0$ for all $s > t$ and $||u||_2 \leq 1$. Denote by x and y the corresponding state and output trajectories. Note that by Lemma 2, y belongs to $L_2(T, Y)$ (cont. time) or $l_2(Y)$ (disc. time) and hence the norm $||y||_2$ exists and it is finite. By combining Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, we obtain that $x(t)^T \mathcal{P}^{-1} x(t) \leq 1$ and

$$x^T(t) \mathscr{Q} x(t) \geq ||y||_2^2$$

Since u, q and t are arbitrary, we then obtain that

$$\sup_{x^T \mathcal{P}^{-1} x \leq 1} x^T \mathscr{Q} x \geq ||Y^{\Sigma}||_H^2$$

We proceed to prove that

$$\lambda_{max}(\mathcal{P}\mathscr{Q}) = \sup_{x^T \mathcal{P}^{-1} x \leq 1} x^T \mathscr{Q} x$$

Let $\mathcal{P}^{-1} = S^T S$, and define $\hat{\mathscr{Q}} = (S^{-1})^T \mathscr{Q} S^{-1}$. It follows that

$$\{Sx \mid x^T \mathcal{P}^{-1} x \leq 1\} = \{v \mid v^T v \leq 1\}.$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{x^T \mathcal{P}^{-1} x \leq 1} x^T \mathscr{Q} x = \sup_{v^T v \leq 1} v^T \hat{\mathscr{Q}} v = \lambda_{\max}(\hat{\mathscr{Q}}),$$

where $\lambda_{max}(\hat{Q})$ is the maximal eigenvalue of $\hat{\mathscr{Q}}$. But $\hat{\mathscr{Q}} = S \mathcal{P} \mathscr{Q} S^{-1}$, hence the eigenvalues of $\hat{\mathscr{Q}}$ and $\mathcal{P}\mathscr{Q}$ coincide. ☐

For nice grammians $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$, the sum of their singular values can be represented as a Frobenius norm of the Hankel-matrix of the system. In order to present this result, we will first recall the notion of a Hankel-matrix for linear switched systems. Although Hankel-matrices can be defined both for continuous- and discrete-time, we will below concentrate on the discrete-time case only. Consider a LSS $\Sigma = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\})$ and for any $v \in Q^*$, define the *Markov-parameter* $M_v = \widetilde{C} A_v \widetilde{B}$, where $\widetilde{C} = \begin{bmatrix} C_1^T, & \dots, & C_D^T \end{bmatrix}^T$ and $\widetilde{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1^T, & \dots, & B_D \end{bmatrix}$. In [26] it was shown that the definition of the Markov-parameter depends only on the input-output map Y^Σ and not on the choice of Σ itself. Define then the *Hankel-matrix* of Y^Σ as the infinite block matrix

$$H = (H_{s,v})_{s,v \in Q^*},$$

rows and columns of which are indexed by sequences from Q^* such that $H_{s,v} = M_{vs}$. Using the notation above, we can relate $\mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q})$ and the Frobenius-norm of H as follows.

Lemma 11. *If $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are the nice grammians of Σ, then*

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q}) = \sum_{v,s \in Q^*} ||H_{s,v}||_F^2,$$

where $||.||_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix.

Proof of Lemma 11. Notice that

$$\mathcal{Q} = \sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T \mathcal{Q} A_q + \widetilde{C}^T \widetilde{C} \text{ and } \mathcal{P} = \sum_{q \in Q} A_q \mathcal{P} A_q^T + \widetilde{B}\widetilde{B}^T.$$

From Lemma 7 it follows that

$$\mathcal{Q} = \sum_{w \in Q^*} A_w^T \widetilde{C}^T \widetilde{C} A_w \text{ and } \mathcal{P} = \sum_{v \in Q^*} A_v \widetilde{B}\widetilde{B}^T A_v^T$$

and hence,

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q} = \sum_{w \in Q^*} \sum_{v \in Q^*} A_v \widetilde{B}\widetilde{B}^T A_v^T A_w^T \widetilde{C}^T \widetilde{C} A_w,$$

and thus

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q}) = \sum_{w \in Q^*} \sum_{v \in Q^*} \mathrm{tr}(A_v \widetilde{B}\widetilde{B}^T A_v^T A_w^T \widetilde{C}^T \widetilde{C} A_w).$$

Notice now that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{tr}((A_v\widetilde{B})(\widetilde{B}^T A_v^T A_w^T \widetilde{C}^T)(\widetilde{C}A_w)) \\
&\qquad = \operatorname{tr}(\widetilde{B}^T A_v^T A_w^T \widetilde{C}^T)(\widetilde{C}A_w A_v \widetilde{B}) \\
&\qquad = \operatorname{tr}(H_{w,v}^T H_{w,v}) \\
&\qquad = ||H_{w,v}||_F^2
\end{aligned}
$$

□

If $\mathcal{P} = \mathscr{Q} = diag(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$, then $\operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{P}\mathscr{Q}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i^2$ and hence the lemma above implies that this quantity does not depend on the state-space representation.

6. Model reduction for linear switched systems

In this section, we state the procedure for model reduction by balanced truncation, and we prove a bound of the approximation error.

Procedure 4. ***Balanced truncation*** *Consider a LSS* $\Sigma = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\})$.

1. *Find a positive definite solution* $\mathscr{Q} > 0$ *to* (9).

2. *Find a positive definite solution* $\mathcal{P} > 0$ *to* (10).

3. *Find* U *such that* $\mathcal{P} = UU^T$ *and find an orthogonal* K *such that* $U^T \mathscr{Q} U = K\Lambda^2 K^T$, *where* Λ *is diagonal with the diagonal elements taken in decreasing order. Define the transformation*

$$\mathcal{S} = \Lambda^{1/2} K^T U^{-1}$$

4. *Replace* Σ *with*

$$\Sigma_{\text{bal}} = (n, Q, (\bar{A}_q = \mathcal{S}A_q\mathcal{S}^{-1}, \bar{B}_q = \mathcal{S}B_q, \bar{C}_q = C_q\mathcal{S}^{-1})_{q\in Q}).$$

5. *The transformed system* Σ_{bal} *is balanced, i.e.,* $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma_{\text{bal}}, \Lambda) < 0$ $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma_{\text{bal}}, \Lambda) < 0$. *Indeed, it is enough to notice that* $\Lambda = (\mathcal{S}^{-1})^T \mathscr{Q} \mathcal{S}^{-1} = \mathcal{S}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}^T$ *and use these expressions to derive* $\mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma_{\text{bal}}, \Lambda) < 0$ *and* $\mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma_{\text{bal}}, \Lambda) < 0$ *from* $\mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) < 0$ *and* $\mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) < 0$ *for all* $q \in Q$.

6. *Assume that* $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n)$, $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_n$. *Choose* $r < n$ *and let* $\Lambda_1 = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r)$. *Choose* $\hat{A}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, $\hat{B}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times m}$ *and* $\hat{C}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$ *so that*

$$\bar{A}_q = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_q & A_{q,12} \\ A_{q,21} & A_{q,22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{B}_q = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{B}_q \\ B_{q,2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{C}_q^T = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_q^T \\ C_{q,2}^T \end{bmatrix} \tag{14}$$

Return as a reduced order model $\hat{\Sigma} = (r, Q, \{(\hat{A}_q, \hat{B}_q, \hat{C}_q) \mid q \in Q\})$.

In the following, we will state an error bound for the difference between the input-output maps of Σ and $\hat{\Sigma}$. To this end, we will use the following simple fact, due to [1] in the continuous case.

Lemma 12. *The LSS* $\hat{\Sigma}$ *returned by Procedure 4 is balanced. In addition, if either* $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) < 0$ *or* $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) < 0$, *then* $\hat{\Sigma}$ *is also quadratically stable.*

Proof of Lemma 12. The first statement of the proof follows by showing that $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \hat{\Sigma}, \Lambda_1) \leq 0$ and $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \hat{\Sigma}, \Lambda_1) \leq 0$. For the continous-time case the proof of this claim is straightforward:

$$\bar{A}_q^T \Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_q \Lambda_1 & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\bar{A}_q \Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_q \Lambda_1 & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}$$

and hence for $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{O}\}$,

$$\mathbf{K}(q, \bar{\Sigma}, \Lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}(q, \hat{\Sigma}, \Lambda_1) & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, if $\mathbf{K}(q, \bar{\Sigma}, \Lambda) \leq 0$, then $\mathbf{K}(q, \hat{\Sigma}, \Lambda_1) \leq 0$.

For the discrete-time case, using the notation of Procedure 4, it is easy to see that if $\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda_2 \end{bmatrix}$ where $\Lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, then

$$\bar{A}_q \Lambda \bar{A}_q^T = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_q \Lambda_1 \hat{A}_q + A_{q,12} \Lambda_2 A_{q,12}^T, & \star \\ \star, & \star \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\bar{A}_q^T \Lambda \bar{A}_q = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_q^T \Lambda_1 \hat{A}_q + A_{q,21}^T \Lambda_2 A_{q,21}, & \star \\ \star, & \star \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence, the corresponding inequalities for the balanced system $\bar{\Sigma}$ can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \bar{A}_q \Lambda \bar{A}_q^T + \bar{B}_q \bar{B}_q^T - \Lambda \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_q \Lambda_1 \hat{A}_q^T + A_{q,12} \Lambda_2 A_{q,12}^T + \hat{B}_q \hat{B}_q^T - \Lambda_1, & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix} \\
0 &\geq \bar{A}_q^T \Lambda \bar{A}_q + \bar{C}_q \bar{C}_q^T - \Lambda \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_q^T \Lambda_1 \hat{A}_q + A_{q,21}^T \Lambda_2 A_{q,21} + \hat{C}_q^T \hat{C}_q^T - \Lambda_1, & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\hat{A}_q \Lambda_1 \hat{A}_q^T + \hat{B}_q \hat{B}_q^T - \Lambda_1 \\
&\qquad \leq \hat{A}_q \Lambda_1 \hat{A}_q^T + A_{q,12} \Lambda_2 A_{q,12}^T + \hat{B}_q \hat{B}_q^T - \Lambda_1 \leq 0 \\
&\hat{A}_q^T \Lambda_1 \hat{A}_q + \hat{C}_q^T \hat{C}_q - \Lambda_1 \\
&\qquad \leq \hat{A}_q^T \Lambda_1 \hat{A}_q + A_{q,21}^T \Lambda_2 A_{q,21} + \hat{C}_q^T \hat{C}_q - \Lambda_1 \leq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

from which it follows that Λ_1 is both a controllability and observability grammian.

The proof above also yields that if $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) < 0$ or $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) < 0$, then $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \hat{\Sigma}, \Lambda_1) < 0$ or respectively $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \hat{\Sigma}, \Lambda_1) < 0$. By Lemma 1 the latter implies that $\hat{\Sigma}$ is quadratically stable. □

Remark 8 (Nice observability/controllability grammian)**.** *In the discrete-time case, one could take the nice observability and controllability grammians from Definition 14 as inputs for Procedure 4. It is clear that the balancing step then leads to a nice controllability and observability grammians which are diagonal and equal to each other. However, from the proof of Lemma 12, it is clear that the resulting reduced order system might be balanced, but the grammian Λ_1 of the reduced system is not necessarily the nice grammian. However, from the proof of Lemma 12, it follows that Λ_1 is the nice observability and controllability grammian of the system $\hat{\Sigma} = (r, Q, \{(\hat{A}_q, \begin{bmatrix} \hat{B}_q, & A_{q,12} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \hat{C}_q \\ A_{q,21} \end{bmatrix}) \mid q \in Q\})$. It remains a topic of future research to find out if the balanced truncation procedure can be adapted in such a way that Λ_1 remains a nice grammian.*

One may wonder if the system $\hat{\Sigma}$ returned by Procedure 4 is minimal, at least when Σ was minimal. The answer is negative, as demonstrated by Example 1. The fact that the reduced system need not even be minimal already indicates that Procedure 4 might be too conservative.

Example 1. *Assume* $Q = \{1\}$ *consists of one element,* $A = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -3 \end{bmatrix}$, $B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. *Then* (A, B, C) *is balanced according to our definition with* $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(2, 1, 0.5)$. *However,* $\hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$, $\hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ *and* $\hat{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, *which is clearly not minimal.*

Theorem 6 (Error bound)**.** *For the system* $\hat{\Sigma}$ *returned by Procedure 4,*

$$||Y^{\Sigma} - Y^{\hat{\Sigma}}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq 2 \sum_{k=r+1}^{n} \sigma_k. \tag{15}$$

Proof of Theorem 6. The proof of Theorem 6 is based in the following lemma whose proof is in Appendix K.

Lemma 13. *For* $r = n - 1$, (15) *is true.*

Suppose that $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ is the reduced system obtained by removing the singular value σ_n. It is easy to see that $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ is again balanced with grammian Λ_1. We can again apply the model reduction procedure to $\hat{\Sigma}_1$, remove its smallest singular value σ_{n-1} and obtain $\hat{\Sigma}_2$. Suppose that the balanced system $\hat{\Sigma}_i$ with grammian $\Lambda_i = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{n-i})$ is given. Define $\hat{\Sigma}_{i+1}$ as the system which is obtained from $\hat{\Sigma}_i$ by applying the balanced truncation to the last state, i.e., to the state which corresponds to σ_{n-i}. In this way, we obtain systems $\hat{\Sigma}_1, \ldots, \hat{\Sigma}_{n-r}$ such that $\dim \hat{\Sigma}_i = n - i$ and $||Y^{\hat{\Sigma}}_{i-1} - Y^{\hat{\Sigma}}_{i}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq 2\sigma_{n-i+1}$, where $\hat{\Sigma}_0 = \Sigma$. Notice that $\hat{\Sigma}_{n-r} = \hat{\Sigma}$

$$||\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-r} ||\hat{\Sigma}_{i-1} - \hat{\Sigma}_i||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq 2 \sum_{k=r+1}^{n} \sigma_k,$$

i.e., the error bound holds. ☐

Remark 9. *Theorem 6 and the second statement of Theorem 3 imply that it is enough to apply balanced truncation to minimal LSSs. Indeed, let us apply balanced truncation to an LSS* Σ *with controllability and observability grammians* $(\mathcal{P}, \mathscr{Q})$*. Assume that* $\sigma_1 \geq \ldots \geq \sigma_n$ *are the singular values of* $(\mathcal{P}, \mathscr{Q})$*,* $n = \dim \Sigma$*. Then the approximation error will be bounded by* $2\sum_{i=r+1}^{n} \sigma_i$*. If we replace* $(\mathcal{P}, \mathscr{Q})$ *by the correspondig grammians* $(\mathcal{P}_m, \mathscr{Q}_m)$ *of a minimal LSS* Σ_m*, as described in Theorem 3, and we perform a balanced truncation by keeping the first* r *singular values, then the error bound becomes* $2\sum_{i=r+1}^{k} \lambda_i \leq 2\sum_{i=r+1}^{n} \sigma_i$*, i.e. the error bound obtained by using the minimal LSS does not exceed that of for the original system.*

7. Relationship with Other Work

Results similar to those presented in this paper have already been obtained by [3, 17, 15]. More precisely, [3] studies the model reduction of a linear parameter varying system,

$$LPV : \begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = A_{q(t)}x(t) + B_{q(t)}u(t), \ x(0) = x_0 \\ y(t) = C_{q(t)}x(t), \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

where q is a continuous function $T \to \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$, $\mathcal{B} = [\underline{\rho}_1, \overline{\rho}_1] \times \ldots \times [\underline{\rho_s}, \overline{\rho_s}]$ for some $\underline{\rho}_i < \overline{\rho}_i$, and A_q, B_q, C_q are assumed to be continuous functions of q. In the following, we will refer to the system (16) as LPV.

The L_2 norm of the LPV system is

$$||Y^{LPV}||_{L_2} = \sup_{q \in C(T,\mathcal{B})} \sup_{||u||_2=1} ||Y^{LPV}(u,q)||_2.$$

Furthermore, [3] uses similar LMI characterization of the L_2 norm. Specifically, if $||Y^{LPV}||_{L_2} < \gamma$ then there exists a solution $P > 0$ to

$$\forall q \in \mathcal{B} \ : \ \mathbf{G}_\gamma(q, LPV, P) < 0.$$

The controllability and observability grammians in [3] are solutions $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ to $\mathbf{O}(q, LPV, \mathcal{Q}) \leq 0$ and $\mathbf{C}(q, LPV, \mathcal{P}) \leq 0$ for all $q \in \mathcal{B}$. Hence, they are also similar to the continuous-time grammians used in this paper.

Despite apparent similarity between the LPV and LSS formulations, the two systems are not compatible as q signal in (16) is assumed to be a continuous function. Hence, the results of [3] are not directly applicable to linear switched systems. Nonetheless, the proof of the error bounds in [3] does not use the continuity of the signal q nor the continuous dependence of A_q, B_q, C_q on q; hence, the proof technique can be adapted to the switched case. As a result, the error bounds for the balanced truncation provided in [3] are similar to (15). Note however, that the style of the proof of Theorem 6 is closer to that of [18] than to [3]. Moreover, counterparts of Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 and Lemma 5, Lemma 6 can be found in [3]. While [3] did state that their model reduction procedure and the estimate of L_2 norm do not change under a state-space isomorphism, the analysis in [3] does not conclude that the existence of LMI estimates of the L_2 norms, or indeed the existence and singular values of the grammians is independent of the choice of state-space realizations. In fact, the latter would be difficult, since there seem to be no realization theory for the type of LPV systems which is considered in [3]. Note that realization theory of certain classes of LPV systems was developed by [33].

In [17], model reduction of uncertain discrete-time systems was investigated. A *structured uncertain system* was viewed as a Linear Fractional Transformation (LFT),

$$M \star \Delta = D + C\Delta(I - A\Delta)^{-1}B,$$

where $\Delta : l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^n) \to l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ represents the uncertainty, and $M = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right]$. The norm of the system M is the supremum of the H_∞ norms of $G \star \Delta$, where Δ is any element of a bounded set of structured disturbances.

The model reduction procedure presented in [17] and the corresponding error bounds are similar to the ones presented here for discrete-time linear switched systems. The main steps of the proofs are also similar. Nonetheless, the precise relationship between the results of [17] and the ones presented above is not yet clear. In an attempt to clarify this connection, we represent a linear switched system as a structured uncertain system as follows.

Let the structured uncertain system associated with a discrete-time switched system $\Sigma = (n, Q, \{(A_q, B_q, C_q) \mid q \in Q\})$ be

$$M_\Sigma = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{cccc|ccc} 0 & A_1 & \dots & A_D & B_1 & \dots & B_D \\ I & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \\ I & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \hline 0 & C_1 & \dots & C_D & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{array}\right]$$

We fix an infinite switching sequence $v = q_0 q_1 \cdots \in \mathcal{Q}$. For a $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the operators $d_q^v : l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^k) \to l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ as follows

$$d_q^v(z)(t) = \begin{cases} z(t)\chi_{\{\tau \mid q_\tau = q\}}(t-1) & \text{if } t > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

where $\chi_{\{\tau \mid q_\tau = q\}}$ is the characteristic function of the set $\{\tau \in \mathbb{N} \mid q_\tau = q\}$. Let $\delta^{-1} : l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^n) \to l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\delta^{-1}(z)(t) = z(t-1)$ for $t > 1$ and $\delta^{-1}(z)(0) = 0$, be the backward shift operator. By abuse of notation, we will apply the operators d_q^v and δ^- to signals in Euclidean spaces of different dimensions without specifying the dimension.

We define the uncertainty structure

$$\Delta^v = \mathrm{diag}(\delta^{-1}, d_1^v, \ldots, d_D^v).$$

For an inputs $u \in l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^m)$, define $w_q = w_q(u) = d_q^v(\delta^{-1}(u))$ and let $x = (x_0, x_1, \ldots)$ be the state trajectory of Σ which corresponds to the inputs u and switching sequence v. If Σ is quadratically stable, then by Lemma 2 $x \in l_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Define $z_q = \delta^{-1}(x)$. With this notation,

$$\begin{bmatrix} x \\ z_1 \\ z_2 \\ \vdots \\ z_D \\ \hline \delta^{-1}(y) \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A\Delta^v & B \\ \hline C\Delta^v & 0 \end{array}\right] \begin{bmatrix} x \\ z_1 \\ z_2 \\ \vdots \\ z_D \\ \hline w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_D \end{bmatrix},$$

where A, B, C are the corresponding sub-matrices of M_Σ. As a consequence, $\delta^{-1}(y) = (M_\Sigma \star \Delta^v)w$ with $w = w(u) = (w_1^T, \ldots, w_D^T)^T$.

We notice that the induced l_2 operator norm of Δ^v is 1 for any $v \in \mathcal{Q}$; hence, following the notion of [17], $\Delta^v \in \mathbf{B}_\Delta$ with

$$\mathbf{B}_\Delta = \{\Delta : l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^{n(D+1)}) \to l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^{n(D+1)}) \mid \|\Delta\| \leq 1\}.$$

Furthermore, l_2-norm of $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_D)$ equals the l_2 norm of $\delta^{-1}(u)$. In [17], the norm $\|M_\Sigma\|$ of M_Σ is defined as follows

$$\|M_\Sigma\| = \sup_{\Delta \in \mathbf{B}_\Delta} \sup_{w \in l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^{mD}), \|w\|_2 = 1} \|(M_\Sigma \star \Delta)w\|_2.$$

We claim that $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq ||M_{\Sigma}||$. Indeed, from $\delta^{-1}(y) = (M_{\Sigma} \star \Delta^{v})w(u)$, it follows that $||\delta^{-1}(y)||_2 \leq ||M_{\Sigma}|| \cdot ||w(u)||_2$. Since $||w(u)||_2 = ||\delta^{-1}(u)||_2$, it then follows that $||\delta^{-1}(y)||_2 \leq ||M_{\Sigma}|| \cdot ||\delta^{-1}(u)||_2$ But $\delta^{-1}(y)$ is the response of Σ to the input $\delta^{-1}(u)$ and the switching signal $\delta^{-1}(v)$. Since the range of all possible choices of $\delta^{-1}(u)$ and $\delta^{-1}(v)$ covers the whole space $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$, we get that

$$\forall (u,q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q} : ||Y^{\Sigma}(u)||_2 \leq ||M_{\Sigma}||||u||_2$$

which implies that $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq ||M_{\Sigma}||$.

Below, we state what we know about the relationship between the model reduction procedure of this paper and that of [17].

Lemma 14. *Let Σ be a discrete-time LSS, and let M_{Σ} be the associated structured uncertain system. Then the following holds.*

1. *If M_{Σ} is stable according to the terminology of [17], then Σ is strongly stable.*

2. *The LSS Σ is minimal if and only if M_{Σ} is minimal according to the terminology of [17].*

3. *Assume that the block-diagonal matrix $\mathcal{P} = \operatorname{diag}(P_1, \ldots, P_{D+1})$, $0 < P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, D+1$ (resp. $\mathscr{Q} = \operatorname{diag}(Q_1, \ldots, Q_{D+1})$ $0 < Q_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, D+1$) is a controllability (resp. observability) grammian of M_{Σ} according to the terminology of [17][2].*

   Then the following holds.

   (a) *P_1 (resp. Q_1) is a controllability (resp. observability) grammian of Σ, and*

   $$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q \in Q} (A_q P_1 A_q^T + B_q B_q^T) - P_1 \leq 0 \\ \sum_{q \in Q} (A_q^T Q_1 A_q + C_q^T C_q) - Q_1 \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

   (b) *If M_{Σ} is balanced, i.e., $\mathcal{P} = \mathscr{Q}$ is diagonal, then Σ is balanced.*

---

[2] Note that according to [17], controllability and observability grammians are by definition block-diagonal

(c) *If M_Σ is balanced and $\hat{\Sigma}$ is the result of applying Procedure 4 with the grammians $P_1 = Q_1$, then $M_{\hat{\Sigma}}$ is a result of applying balanced truncation to M_Σ.*

The proof of Lemma 14 is presented in Appendix L. One is tempted to try to use [17] for model reduction of LSSs. However, this leads to the following challenges.

- In order to apply the methods of [17], M_Σ has to be stable. By Lemma 14, stability of M_Σ implies strong stability of Σ. Note that strong stability is a more restrictive property than quadratic stability. Hence, the scope of applicability of [17] appears to be smaller than that of the current paper.

- Even if M_Σ is stable, we face restrictions. While by Lemma 14, grammians of M_Σ yield grammians of Σ, it is not clear that the converse holds. Hence, the error bound obtained by using [17] might be more conservative.

- Let $\hat{M}$ be the result of balanced truncation applied to M_Σ, as described in [17]. Then $\hat{M}$ is a structured uncertain system, but it is not clear how to convert the $\hat{M}$ to an LSS. In fact, even balancing might destroy the very specific structure of M_Σ and hence make it difficult to interpret the balanced version of M_Σ as an LSS.

- Finally, while for balanced M_Σ, the results of Procedure 4 and the procedure from [17] are comparable, it is not very clear how these two procedures are related in the general case.

Despite the difficulties mentioned above, exploring the relationship with [17] remains worthwhile. In particular, the results of Lemma 14 indicate that the relationship might be much closer than it appears at the first sight. Intuitively, it is also clear why [17] seems to yield more conservative results: the behavior of an LSS corresponds to a *subset* of behaviors of a structured uncertain system. Hence, the model reduction procedure of [17] has to preserve a much richer behavior than the one presented in this paper. To sum up, despite numerous similarities, it is unclear if [17] can be used for model reduction of LSSs.

Concerning the work of [15], the main difference is that we consider deterministic systems, while [15] considers stochastic systems with switching modeled as a Markov process on Q. The nice grammians of the present paper correspond to the grammians of [15], if we associate with the discrete-time deterministic Σ the following stochastic system

$$\Sigma_{\mathrm{st}} : \begin{cases} \widetilde{x}(t+1) = \dfrac{1}{\sqrt{p}} A_{\theta(t)} \widetilde{x}(t) + \dfrac{1}{\sqrt{p}} B_{\theta(t)} u(t) \\ \widetilde{y}(t) = \dfrac{1}{\sqrt{p}} C_{\theta(t)} \widetilde{x}(t), \end{cases}$$

where $\theta(t) \in Q$ is an identically distributed independent process, $u(t)$ is deterministic, $x_0 = 0$, and $p = P(\theta(t) = q) > 0$ for all $q \in Q$. In [15], the norm of the system is smaller than γ if $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} E[||\widetilde{y}(t)||^2] \leq \gamma^2 ||u||_2^2$. To ensure that the system norm is finite, the stochastic systems at hand are assumed to be mean-square stable and only inputs $u \in l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ are considered. With the correspondence above, the balancing procedure in our work becomes similar to that of [15]. This is summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 15. *Consider the discrete-time LSS Σ and let Σ_{st} be the associated stochastic system. Then the following holds.*

1. *If Σ is strongly stable if and only if Σ_{st} is mean-square stable according to [15].*
2. *$\mathcal{P}$ (resp. $\mathscr{Q}$) is a controllability (resp. observability) grammian of Σ_{st} according to the terminology of [15] if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{q \in Q} (A_q \mathcal{P} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T) - \mathcal{P} \leq 0 \\ &\sum_{q \in Q} (A_q^T \mathscr{Q} A_q + C_q^T C_q) - \mathscr{Q} \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

   In particular, controllability and observability grammians of Σ_{st} are controllability and observability grammians of Σ. Conversely, nice controllability and nice observability grammians of Σ are controllability and observability grammians of Σ_{st}.

3. *The balanced reduction algorithm presented in [15] coincides with Procedure 4, if the latter is applied to grammians of (15).*
4. *If the norm of Σ_{st} is γ according to [15], then $||Y^{\Sigma}||_{l_2} \leq \gamma$.*

The proof of Lemma 15 is presented in Appendix M. From Lemma 15, it follows that the error bound for the balanced truncation in (15) follows from the error bound derived in [15], if one uses nice grammians. However, in [15] the questions related to minimality and dependence of the grammians on state-space realization were not discussed. Note that the results [15] are directly applicable only to strongly stable linear switched systems, while the results of the current paper are formulated for quadratically stable LSSs. Furthermore, note that [15] is applicable only to a subset of grammians. For this reason, the model reduction procedure from [15], when applied to deterministic LSSs via the embedding above, is likely to yield a more conservative error bound. This is not suprising, since [15] addresses model reduction of stochastic systems, of which deterministic systems form a subclass.

References

[1] H. Shaker, R. Wisniewski, Generalized gramian framework for model/controller order reduction of switched systems, International Journal of Systems Science, in press.

[2] H. Shaker, R. Wisniewski, Generalized gramian framework for model/controller order reduction of switched systems, in: Proc. European Control Conference, 2009.

[3] G. Wood, P. Goddard, K. Glover, Approximation of linear parameter-varying systems, in: Decision and Control, 1996., Proceedings of the 35th IEEE, Vol. 1, 1996, pp. 406 –411 vol.1. `doi:10.1109/CDC.1996.574345`.

[4] J. P. Hespanha, Root-mean-square gains of switched linear systems, IEEE Trans. on Automat. Contr. 48 (11).

[5] M. Petreczky, R. Wisniewski, J. Leith, Theoretical analysis of balanced truncation of linear switched systems, in: Proc. 4th IFAC Conf. on Analysis and Design of Hybrid Systems, accepted, 2012.

[6] A. Birouche, J. Guilet, B. Mourillon, M. Basset, Gramian based approach to model order-reduction for discrete-time switched linear systems, in: Proc. Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation, 2010.

[7] L. Zhang, P. Shi, E. Boukas, C. Wang, Model reduction for uncertain switched linear discrete-time systems, Automatica 44 (11) (2008) 2944 – 2949.

[8] E. Mazzi, A. Vincentelli, A. Balluchi, A. Bicchi, Hybrid system model reduction, in: IEEE International conference on Decision and Control, 2008.

[9] C. Habets, J. H. van Schuppen, Reduction of affine systems on polytopes, in: International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems, 2002.

[10] L. Zhang, E. Boukas, P. Shi, Mu-dependent model reduction for uncertain discrete-time switched linear systems with average dwell time, International Journal of Control 82 (2) (2009) 378– 388.

[11] L. Zhang, P. Shi, Model reduction for switched lpv systems with average dwell time, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 53 (2008) 2443–2448.

[12] H. Gao, J. Lam, C. Wang, Model simplification for switched hybrid systems, Systems & Control Letters 55 (2006) 1015–1021.

[13] G. Kotsalis, A. Megretski, M. A. Dahleh, Balanced truncation for a class of stochastic jump linear systems and model reduction of hidden markov models, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 53 (11).

[14] G. Kotsalis, A. Rantzer, Balanced truncation for discrete-time markov jump linear systems, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 55 (11).

[15] G. Kotsalis, Model reduction for hidden Markov models, Ph.D. thesis, Massachusets Institute of Technology (2006).

[16] N. Monshizadeh, H. Trentelman, M. Camlibel, A simultaneous balanced truncation approach to model reduction of switched linear systems, Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on PP (99) (2012) 1. `doi:10.1109/TAC.2012.2202031`.

[17] C. L. Beck, Model reduction and minimality for uncertain systems, Ph.D. thesis, California Institute of Technology (1996).

[18] H. Sandberg, Model reduction for linear time-varying systems, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Sweden (2004).

[19] M. Margaliot, J. P. Hespanha, Root-mean-square gains of switched linear systems: A variational approach, Automatica 44 (9) (2008) 2398–2402.

[20] K. Hirata, J. P. Hespanha, $\mathcal{L}_2$-induced gain analysis for a class of switched systems, in: Proc. of the 48th Conf. on Decision and Contr., 2009.

[21] M. Petreczky, R. Vidal, Metrics and topology for nonlinear and hybrid systems, in: Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, 2007.

[22] M. Petreczky, R. Peeters, Spaces of nonlinear and hybrid systems representable by recognizable formal power series, in: Proc. MTNS2010, 2010, pp. 1051–1058.

[23] S. Eilenberg, Automata, Languages and Machines, Academic Press, New York, London, 1974.

[24] M. Petreczky, Realization theory of linear and bilinear switched systems: A formal power series approach, part i, ESAIM COCV 17 (2011) 410–445.

[25] M. Petreczky, Realization theory of hybrid systems, Ph.D. thesis, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam (2006).

[26] M. Petreczky, L. Bako, J. H. van Schuppen, Realization theory for discrete-time linear switched systems, Tech. Rep. arXiv:1103.1343v1, ArXiv, a version is provisionally accepted to Automatica (2011).

[27] M. Petreczky, Realization theory for linear switched systems: Formal power series approach, Systems & Control Letters 56 (2007) 588–595.

[28] Z. Sun, S. S. Ge, Switched Linear Systems: Control and Design, Springer, London, 2005.

[29] D. Liberzon, Switching in Systems and Control, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2003.

[30] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, V. Balakrishnan, Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory, SIAM, 1994.

[31] F. Gantmacher, Theory of Matrices, Vol. 1, Chelsea Publishing Company, New York, N.Y., 1959.

[32] O. Costa, M. Fragoso, R. Marques, Discrete-Time Markov Jump Linear Systems, Springer Verlag, 2005.

[33] R. Tóth, Identification and Modeling of Linear Parameter-Varying Systems, Springer Verlag. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 403, 2010.

[34] N. Bhatia, G. Szego, Stability theory of dynamical systems, Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1970.

Appendix A. Technical proofs

For some of the proofs below we will need the following simple consequence of using Schur complements.

Lemma 16. *Let* $A, P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $S \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, $P > 0$. *Let* $\epsilon \in \{<, \leq\}$ *Then the following holds.*

1. $A^T P + PA + S^T S \;\epsilon\; 0$, *if and only if* $AP^{-1} + P^{-1}A^T + P^{-1}S^T S P^{-1} \;\epsilon\; 0$, *or, equivalently*
$$\begin{bmatrix} P^{-1}A^T + AP^{-1} & P^{-1}S^T \\ SP^{-1} & -I \end{bmatrix} \epsilon 0.$$

2. $-P + A^T P A + S^T S \;\epsilon\; 0$, *if and only if*
$$\begin{bmatrix} -P^{-1} + AP^{-1}A^T & -AP^{-1}S^T \\ -SAP^{-1} & -I + SP^{-1}S^T \end{bmatrix} \;\epsilon\; 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 16. The first statement follows by multiplying $A^T P + PA + S^T S$ by P^{-1} from left and right and noticing that since P^{-1} is symmetric, $A^T P + PA + S^T S \epsilon 0$ is equivalent to $P^{-1}(A^T P + PA + S^T S)P^{-1} \epsilon 0$. By taking Schur complements, it follows that $AP^{-1} + P^{-1}A^T + P^{-1}S^T S P^{-1} \;\epsilon\; 0$ is equivalent to
$$\begin{bmatrix} P^{-1}A^T + AP^{-1} & P^{-1}S^T \\ SP^{-1} & -I \end{bmatrix} \;\epsilon\; 0.$$

In order to prove the second statement, the discrete case, notice that $-P + A^T PA + S^T S \,\epsilon\, 0$ is equivalent to

$$-(P - \begin{bmatrix} A \\ S \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A \\ S \end{bmatrix}) \,\epsilon\, 0.$$

Using Schur complements again, the latter is equivalent to

$$-\begin{bmatrix} P & A^T & S^T \\ A & P^{-1} & 0 \\ S & 0 & I_k \end{bmatrix} \,\epsilon\, 0$$

Multiplying the latter inequality by $\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{k+n} \\ I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ from right and by $\mathcal{S}^T$ from left, we get the following equivalent LMI

$$-\begin{bmatrix} P^{-1} & 0 & A \\ 0 & I_k & S \\ A^T & S^T & P \end{bmatrix} \,\epsilon\, 0.$$

By using Schur complement again, from this we obtain that the latter LMI is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} -P^{-1} + AP^{-1}A^T & -AP^{-1}S^T \\ -SP^{-1}A^T & -I_k + SP^{-1}S^T \end{bmatrix} \,\epsilon\, 0.$$

□

Appendix B.

Proof of Lemma 1. **(ii) implies (i)** It is clear that if $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) < 0$, then $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{S}(q, \Sigma, \mathscr{Q}) < 0$.

(iii) implies (i) If $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) < 0$, then by taking $A = A_q^T$ and $S = B_q B_q^T$, it follows from Lemma 16 that $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{S}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}^{-1}) < 0$.

(i) implies (ii) and (iii). We present the proof separately for the discrete-time and for the continuous-time case.

Continuous-time: Assume that for some $P > 0$, $\forall q \in Q : A_q^T P + PA_q < 0$. Then for any $q \in Q$, the exists a scalar $\gamma_q > 0$ such that $A_q^T P + PA_q + \gamma_q M_q < 0$. Take $M_q = C_q^T C_q$ and let $\gamma = \min\{\gamma_q \mid q \in Q\}$. Then $A_q^T P + PA_q + \gamma M_q < 0$. Define $\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{\gamma} P$. Then

$$\forall q \in Q : A_q^T \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{S} A_q + M_q < 0.$$

By choosing M to be $C_q^T C_q$ and $\mathscr{Q} = \mathcal{S}$, we obtain a solution to (9). If we choose $M_q = PB_q B_q^T P$, then using the fact that $\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{\gamma}P$ and Lemma 16, we get that

$$\forall q \in Q : A_q \mathcal{S}^{-1} + \mathcal{S}^{-1} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T \gamma^2 < 0.$$

By choosing $\mathcal{P} = \frac{1}{\gamma^2}\mathcal{S}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\gamma}P^{-1}$ and using Schur complements, we get that (10) holds.

Discrete-time: If $P > 0$ is such that $P - A_q^T P A_q > 0$, then for any $M_q \geq 0$, there exists $\gamma_q > 0$ such that $P - A_q^T P A_q - \gamma_q M_q > 0$. In particular, by taking $\gamma = \min\{\gamma_q \mid q \in Q\}$, $P - A_q^T P A_q - \gamma M_q > 0$, or, in other words

$$\forall q \in Q : A_q^T \mathcal{S} A_q + M_q - \mathcal{S} < 0,$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{\gamma}P$. If we choose $M_q = C_q C_q^T$ and set $\mathscr{Q} = \mathcal{S}$, then we get that (9) holds. From the second part of Lemma 16 it follows that if $P - A_q^T P A_q > 0$, then $P^{-1} - A_q P^{-1} A_q^T > 0$. By interchanging A_q and A_q^T and using P^{-1} instead of P, we can repeat the argument above. We thus get that for any $M_q \geq 0$, there exists $\mathcal{P} > 0$ such that

$$\forall q \in Q : A_q \mathcal{P} A_q^T + M_q - \mathcal{P} < 0.$$

By taking $M_q = B_q B_q^T$, it follows that (10) holds. □

Appendix C.

Proof of Lemma 2. In continuous-time, the proof that existence of a solution $P > 0$ to (12) implies that $||Y^\Sigma||_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ exists and $||Y^\Sigma||_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \gamma$ follows from [20, Theorem 1] by taking $V(x) = x^T P x$. A similar argument can be done for the discrete-time case.

In order to be self-contained, we present an elementary proof of the implication

$$\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{G}_\gamma(q, P, \Sigma) < 0 \implies ||Y^\Sigma||_{\mathcal{L}_2} < \gamma$$

both for the continuous- and discrete-time case.

Fix an input and switching signal $(u, q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$ and denote by x and y the corresponding state and output trajectory of Σ. We have to show that for $u \in \mathcal{U}$, the output y belongs to $L_2(T, \mathbb{R}^p)$ for continuous-time case and to $l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^p)$ for the discrete-time case.

Notice that if we define

$$||y||_2 = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\lim_{t\to\infty} \int_0^t ||y(s)||_2^2 ds} & \text{cont.} \\ \sqrt{\lim_{t\to\infty} \sum_{s=0}^t ||y(s)||_2^2 ds} & \text{disc.} \end{cases}$$

then $||y||_2$ is well-defined (possibly equal $+\infty$) and y belongs to the $L_2(T, \mathbb{R}^p)$ (resp. $l_2(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{R}^p)$) if and only if $||y||_2 < +\infty$. In the latter case, $||y||_2$ is just the standard L_2 and l_2 norm respectively. Hence, it is enough to show $||y||_2^2 \leq \gamma^2 ||u||_2^2$, if we use the extended definition of $||y||_2$ described above.

Assume P is a solution to (12). Define

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta(x^T(t)Px(t)) \\ &\qquad = \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}(x^T(t)Px(t)) & \text{(cont.)} \\ x^T(t+1)Px(t+1) - x^T(t)Px(t) & \text{(disc.)} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then a simple calculation reveals that both for continuous and discrete-time cases,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(x^T(t)Px(t)) = {} & \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix}^T G_\gamma(q(t), P, \Sigma) \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ & + \gamma^2 ||u(t)||_2^2 - x(t)^T C_{q(t)}^T C_{q(t)} x(t) \\ & \leq \gamma^2 ||u(t)||^2 - ||y(t)||^2 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for continuous-time systems

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \Delta(x^T(s)Px(s)) &= x^T(t)Px(t) - x^T(0)Px(0) \\ &= x^T(t)Px(t). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the discrete-time systems,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \Delta(x^T(s)Px(s)) &= x^T(t)Px(t) - x^T(0)Px(0) \\ &= x^T(t)Px(t). \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, we used the fact that $x(0) = 0$ (see page 9). Recall that for continuous-time case

$$||u||_2^2 = \int_0^\infty ||u(s)||_2^2 ds \geq \int_0^t ||u(s)||_2^2 ds.$$

Similarly, for the discrete-time case,

$$||u||_2^2 = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} ||u(s)||_2^2 \geq \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} ||u(s)||_2^2.$$

Hence, by taking integral in the continuous-time case and sums in the discrete-time case, we obtain

$$x^T(t)Px(t) \leq \gamma^2 ||u||_2^2 - \begin{cases} \int_0^t ||y(s)||_2^2 ds & \text{(cont.)} \\ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} ||y(s)||_2^2 & \text{(disc.)} \end{cases}.$$

Since $P > 0$, $x^T(t)Px(t) \geq 0$ and thus the inequality above yields

$$\begin{cases} \int_0^t ||y(s)||_2^2 ds & \text{(cont.)} \\ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} ||y(s)||_2^2 & \text{(disc.)} \end{cases} \leq \gamma^2 ||u||_2^2.$$

By taking limit of the left-hand side as $t \to \infty$, it follows that $||y||_2^2 \leq \gamma^2 ||u||_2^2$.

If Σ is quadratically stable, then by Lemma 1, there exists $\mathcal{P} > 0$ such that $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}) < 0$. By taking $A = A_q^T$, $S = B_q^T$ in Lemma 16, it then follows that for all $q \in Q$,

$$G_1(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}^{-1}) - \begin{bmatrix} C_q^T C_q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} < 0.$$

Since $C_q^T C_q \geq 0$, it then follows that there exists a large enough $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$G_1(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}^{-1}) + (\frac{1}{\gamma^2} - 1) \begin{bmatrix} C_q^T C_q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} < 0. \tag{C.1}$$

Notice now that

$$\gamma^2 G_1(q, \Sigma, \mathcal{P}^{-1}) = G_\gamma(q, \Sigma, \gamma^2 \mathcal{P}^{-1}) + (\gamma^2 - 1) \begin{bmatrix} C_q^T C_q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

By multiplying (C.1) with γ^2 and using the equality above,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> G_\gamma(q, \Sigma, \gamma^2 \mathcal{P}^{-1}) + (\gamma^2 - 1) \begin{bmatrix} C_q^T C_q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + (1 - \gamma^2) \begin{bmatrix} C_q^T C_q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= G_\gamma(q, \Sigma, \gamma^2 \mathcal{P}^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\gamma^2 \mathcal{P}^{-1}$ satisfies (12). $\square$

Appendix D.

Proof of Lemma 3. In the proof we will used the notation (7) of Procedure 1. The lemma follows from the following observations.
Observation 1

$$A_q^T P + P A_q = \begin{bmatrix} (A_q^R)^T P_{11} + P_{11} A_q^R & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}$$

Observation 2

$$\begin{aligned} A_q^T P A_q &= \begin{bmatrix} (A_q^R)^T P_{11} & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_q^{\mathrm{R}} & A_q^{\prime} \\ 0 & A_q^{\prime\prime} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (A_q^R)^T P_{11} A_q^R & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Observation 3

$$C_q^T C_q = \begin{bmatrix} (C_q^R)^T C_q^R & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}$$

Observation 4

$$P B_q = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} B_q \\ \star \end{bmatrix}.$$

Observation 5

$$B_q^T P B_q = (B_q^R)^T P_{11} B_q^R.$$

If $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{S}$, then **Observation 1** implies the statement of the lemma for the continuous-time case and **Observation 2** implies the statement of the lemma for discrete-time case.

Finally, by combining **Observation 3**, **Observation 1** and **Observation 4**, it follows that for continuous time

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{G}_\gamma(q, \Sigma, P) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (A_q^R)^T P_{11} + P_{11} A_q^R + (C_q^R)^T C_q^R & \star & P_{11} B_q^R \\ \star & \star & \star \\ (B_q^R)^T P_{11} & \star & -\gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{G}_\gamma(q, \Sigma, P) < 0$ implies that

$$\begin{bmatrix} (A_q^R)^T P_{11} + P_{11} A_q^R + (C_q^R)^T C_q^R & P_{11} B_q^R \\ (B_q^R)^T P_{11} & -\gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix} < 0,$$

and the latter is equivalent to $\mathbf{G}_\gamma(q, \Sigma_R, P_{11}) < 0$. By combining **Observation 3**, **Observation 2** and **Observation 5** for discrete-time case, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{G}_\gamma(q, \Sigma, P) \\ &\quad = \begin{bmatrix} (A_q^R)^T P_{11} A_q^R + (C_q^R)^T C_q^R & \star & (A_q^R)^T P_{11}^T B_q^R \\ \star & \star & \star \\ A_q^R P_{11} B_q^R & \star & B_q^R P_{11} (B_q^R)^T - \gamma^2 I \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{D.2}$$

Hence, by a similar argument as for the continuous-time case, $\mathbf{G}_\gamma(q, \Sigma, P) < 0$ implies $\mathbf{G}_\gamma(q, \Sigma_r, P_{11}) < 0$.

By combining **Observation 3**, **Observation 2**, and **Observation 1**, it follows that

$$\mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, P) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma_r, P_{11}) & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix},$$

and hence $\mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma, P) \leq 0$ implies $\mathbf{O}(q, \Sigma_r, P_{11}) \leq 0$.

Finally, we will show that if $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma, P^{-1}) \leq 0$, then $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma_r, P_{11}^{-1}) \leq 0$. From Lemma 16 it follows that $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma_r, P^{-1}) \leq 0$ if and only if $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{G}_1(q, \Sigma, P) - C_q^T C_q \leq 0$. From **Observation 3** and (D.1) – (D.2) it follows that $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{G}_1(q, \Sigma, P) - C_q^T C_q \leq 0$ implies $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{G}_1(q, \Sigma_r, P_{11}) - (C_q^R)^T C_q^R \leq 0$. From Lemma 16 it then follows that $\mathbf{C}(q, \Sigma_r, P_{11}^{-1}) \leq 0$ for all $q \in Q$. ☐

Appendix E.

Proof Lemma 4. The first part of the statement follows directly from Lemma 16 by taking $S = 0$. The second statement follows by noticing that $P \in \mathbf{O}(\Sigma) \iff P \in \mathbf{C}(\Sigma^T)$ and $P \in \mathbf{C}(\Sigma) \iff P \in \mathbf{O}(\Sigma^T)$. The third statement can be seen as follows. For the continuous-time case, notice that $P \in G_\gamma(\Sigma)$ is equivalent to

$$\forall q \in Q : A_q^T P + P A_q + C_q^T C_q + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} P B_q B_q^T P < 0. \tag{E.1}$$

By applying Lemma 16 to (E.1) it then follows that (E.1) is equivalent to

$$\forall q \in Q : P^{-1} A_q^T + A_q P^{-1} + P^{-1} C_q^T C_q P^{-1} + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} B_q B_q^T < 0. \tag{E.2}$$

If we multiply (E.2) by γ^2, we immediately get that $R = \gamma^2 P^{-1}$ satisfies

$$\forall q \in Q : A_q R + R A_q^T + B_q B_q^T + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} R C_q^T C_q R,$$

and the latter is equivalent to $R \in G_\gamma(\Sigma^T)$.

For the discrete-time case, notice that $P \in G_\gamma(\Sigma)$ is equivalent to

$$\forall q \in Q : \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{\gamma^2} P + A_q^T \frac{1}{\gamma^2} P A_q + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} C_q^T C_q & A_q^T \frac{1}{\gamma^2} P B_q \\ (A_q^T \frac{1}{\gamma^2} P B_q)^T & B_q^T \frac{1}{\gamma^2} P B_q - I \end{bmatrix} < 0 \tag{E.3}$$

From (E.3) it follows that

$$\forall q \in Q : \hat{P} - \hat{A}_q^T \hat{P} \hat{A}_q > 0 \tag{E.4}$$

where

$$\hat{A}_q = \begin{bmatrix} A_q & B_q \\ \frac{1}{\gamma} C_q & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \hat{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\gamma^2} P & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Applying the discrete-time part of Lemma 16 with $S = 0$, $P = \hat{P}$ and $A = \hat{A}_q$, we get that (E.4) is equivalent to

$$\forall q \in Q : \hat{P}^{-1} - \hat{A}_q \hat{P}^{-1} \hat{A}_q^T > 0. \tag{E.5}$$

Using the definition of $\hat{A}_q$ and the fact that $\hat{P}^{-1} = \operatorname{diag}(\gamma^2 P^{-1}, I)$, it follows that (E.5) is equivalent to

$$\forall q \in Q : \begin{bmatrix} -R + A_q R A_q^T + B_q^T B_q & \frac{1}{\gamma} A_q^T R C_q \\ (\frac{1}{\gamma} A_q^T R C_q)^T & \frac{1}{\gamma^2} C_q^T R C_q - I \end{bmatrix} < 0, \tag{E.6}$$

where $R = \gamma^2 P^{-1}$. By multiplying (E.6) by $\operatorname{diag}(I_n, \gamma I_p)$ from left and right, it follows that (E.6) is equivalent to $\gamma^2 P^{-1} \in G_\gamma(\Sigma^T)$. □

Appendix F.

Proof of Lemma 5. Fix a switching signal $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and denote by $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ the state trajectory of Σ such that $x(0) = x$ and $u = 0$, i.e. $x = X_0^\Sigma(0, q)$ and $y = Y_0^\Sigma(0, q)$. Define

$$\Delta(x^T(t)\mathscr{Q}x(t)) \\ = \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}(x^T(t)\mathscr{Q}x(t)) & \text{(cont.)} \\ x^T(t+1)\mathscr{Q}x(t+1) - x^T(t)\mathscr{Q}x(t) & \text{(disc.)} \end{cases}$$

and denote

$$\mathbf{S}(q, \mathscr{Q}) = \begin{cases} A_q^T \mathscr{Q} + \mathscr{Q} A_q & \text{(cont.)} \\ A_q^T \mathscr{Q} A_q & \text{(disc.)} \end{cases}.$$

Then $\mathscr{Q}$ satisfies $\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{S}(q, \mathscr{Q}) \leq -C_q^T C_q$ and

$$\Delta(x^T(t) \mathscr{Q} x(t)) = x^T(t) \mathbf{S}(q(t), \mathscr{Q}) x(t).$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\Delta(x^T(t) \mathscr{Q} x(t)) \leq -x^T(t) C_{q(t)}^T C_{q(t)} x(t) = -||y(t)||_2^2. \tag{F.1}$$

Notice that

$$x^T(t) \mathscr{Q} x(t) - x^T \mathscr{Q} x = \begin{cases} \int_0^t \Delta(x^T(s) \mathscr{Q} x(s)) ds & \text{(cont.)} \\ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \Delta(x^T(t) \mathscr{Q} x(t)) & \text{(disc.)} \end{cases}$$

and that $x^T(t) \mathscr{Q} x(t) \geq 0$ and hence $-x^T \mathscr{Q} x \leq x^T(t) \mathscr{Q} x(t) - x^T \mathscr{Q} x$. By taking integrals $\int_0^t ||y(s)||_2^2 ds$ in the continuous-time case and sums $\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} ||y(s)||_2^2$ in the discrete-time case, and using (F.1) it follows that

$$-x^T \mathscr{Q} x \leq \begin{cases} -\int_0^t ||y(s)||_2^2 ds & \text{(cont.)} \\ -\sum_{k=0}^{t} ||y(s)||_2^2 & \text{(disc.)} \end{cases}.$$

By multiplying the inequality above by -1 the statement of the lemma follows. □

Appendix G.

Proof of Lemma 6. Denote by Σ_0 the LSS Σ_0 obtained from Σ by replacing C_q, $q \in Q$ by zero matrices. For any input $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and switching signal $q\mathcal{Q}$, the state trajectory $x(t)$ of Σ_0 and Σ are the same, but the output trajectory y_0 of Σ_0 is identically zero. By taking $A = A_q^T$, $S = B_q^T$, $q \in Q$, from Lemma 16 it follows that $\mathcal{P}^{-1}$ satisfies

$$\forall q \in Q : \mathbf{G}_1(q, \mathcal{P}^{-1}, \Sigma_0) \leq 0.$$

Hence, from the proof of Lemma 2 (when applied to Σ_0 instead of Σ) it follows that

$$x^T(t) \mathcal{P}^{-1} x(t) \leq ||u||_2^2 - ||y_0||_2^2 = ||u||_2^2.$$

□

Appendix H.

Proof of Lemma 7. One can easily see that the matrix $\widetilde{A} = \sum_{q \in Q} F_q^T \otimes F_q^T$ is in fact a matrix representation of the linear map $\mathrm{Z} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ defined as

$$\mathrm{Z}(V) = \sum_{q \in Q} F_q^T V F_q.$$

This result is obtained by identifying $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$, as it is done in [32, Section 2.1]. As a consequence, the eigenvalues of Z and $\widetilde{A}$ coincide. Since the eigenvalues of Z are inside the unit circle, it follows from [32, Proposition 2.6] that $P = \mathrm{Z}(P) + Q$ has a unique solution. Notice that using the terminology of [32, page 17] Z is a Hermitian map and positive operator. Indeed, if V is symmetric, then so is $\mathrm{Z}(V)$ and if V is positive semi-definite, then so is $\mathrm{Z}(V)$. Hence, by [32, Proposition 2.6] the solution of $P = \mathrm{Z}(P) + \mathcal{G}$ is positive semi-definite, and if $\mathcal{G} > 0$, then P is positive definite. Moreover, notice that $\mathrm{Z}^k(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{w \in Q^*, |w| = k} F_w^T \mathcal{G} F_w$ and hence by [32, Proposition 2.6], the solution $P = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Z}^k(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{w \in Q^*} F_w^T \mathcal{G} F_w$.

Conversely, assume that $P - \sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T P A_q > 0$ for some $P > 0$. Consider an $n \times n$ matrix V such that $V \geq 0$. Define the map $\mathrm{K}(V) = \sum_{q \in Q} A_q V A_q^T$ and notice that using the coordinate representation of [32, page 17], $\widetilde{A}^T = \sum_{q \in Q} F_q \otimes F_q$ is the matrix representation of K. Since taking transposes preserves eigenvalues, it then follows that it is enough to show that $\widetilde{A}^T$ is a stable matrix. If we can show that $\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathrm{K}^k(V) = 0$, then by [32, Proposition 2.5] it follows that $\widetilde{A}^T$ is a stable matrix. In order to show $\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathrm{K}^k(V) = 0$, we use a Lyapunov-like argument. That is, we define $W(V) = \mathrm{tr}(V^T P)$ and we show that it behaves like a Lyapunov function. More precisely, denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the set of all $n \times n$ positive semi-definite matrices. Notice that $\mathrm{K} : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}$ is a continuous map, if $\mathcal{P}$ is viewed as a metric space with the metric $d(V_1, V_2) = ||V_1 - V_2||_F = \mathrm{tr}((V_1 - V_2)^T (V_1 - V_2))$. Notice moreover that $\mathrm{K}(0) = 0$. Hence, if W satisfies the properties below, then by [34, Theorem 2.12] the dynamical system $V_{k+1} = \mathrm{K}(V_k)$ defined on $\mathcal{P}$ is globally asymptotically stable for the equilibrium point 0, i.e. $\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathrm{K}^k(V) = 0$ for any $V \in \mathcal{P}$. The properties W has to satisfy are the following.

1. $W : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, $W(S) \geq 0$ for any $S \in \mathcal{P}$,
2. $W(S) = 0$ iff $S = 0$, for all $S \in \mathcal{P}$,

3. $W(\mathrm{K}(S)) < W(S)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{P}$, $S \neq 0$,

4. W is radially unbounded[3], more specifically

$$\lim_{||S||_F \to \infty} W(S) = +\infty.$$

The first two properties follow from the definition. To see $W(\mathrm{K}(V)) \leq W(V)$ for any $V \geq 0$, notice that $V^{\frac{1}{2}}$ exists [4] $(V^{\frac{1}{2}})^T = V^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and that

$$\begin{aligned}
W(V) &= \mathrm{tr}(V^T P) = \mathrm{tr}(VP) = \mathrm{tr}(V^{\frac{1}{2}} P V^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i^T V^{\frac{1}{2}} P V^{\frac{1}{2}} e_i \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{q \in Q} e_i^T V^{\frac{1}{2}} A_q^T P A_q V^{\frac{1}{2}} e_i \\
&= \sum_{q \in Q} \mathrm{tr}((V^{\frac{1}{2}} A_q^T) P A_q V^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= \sum_{q \in Q} \mathrm{tr}(A_q V A_q^T P) = \sum_{q \in Q} \mathrm{tr}((A_q V A_q^T)^T P) = W(\mathrm{K}(V)).
\end{aligned}$$

In order to see that W is radially unbounded, notice that there exists $m > 0$ such that $P - mI > 0$. Hence for any $S \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
W(S) &= \mathrm{tr}(S^T P) = \mathrm{tr}(SP) = \mathrm{tr}(S^{\frac{1}{2}} P S^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i^T S^{\frac{1}{2}} P S^{\frac{1}{2}} e_i \\
&\geq m \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i^T S e_i = \mathrm{tr}(V) = ||S^{\frac{1}{2}}||_F^2
\end{aligned}$$

Since the Frobenius norm is subadditive, it follows that $||S||_F \leq ||S^{\frac{1}{2}}||^2$ and hence

$$\forall S \geq 0 : m||S||_F \leq W(S). \tag{H.1}$$

Hence, $W(S)$ is radially unbounded, i.e., $\lim_{||S|| \to \infty} W(S) = +\infty$. $\square$

---

[3] Using the terminology of [34], this property implies that W is uniformly unbounded

[4] here $V^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is the unique matrix such that $V = (V^{\frac{1}{2}})^2$)

Appendix I.

Proof of Lemma 8. Notice that state-space isomorphism preserves strong stability. Indeed, if Σ_1 and Σ_2 are related by an isomorphism $\mathcal{S}$ and their corresponding matrices are A_q and F_q, $q \in Q$, then $F_q = \mathcal{S} A_q \mathcal{S}^{-1}$ and hence, $\sum_{q\in Q} F_q^T \otimes F_q^T = (\mathcal{S}^{-T} \otimes \mathcal{S}^{-T})(\sum_{q\in Q} A_q^T \otimes A_q^T)(\mathcal{S}^T \otimes \mathcal{S}^T)$. That is, $\sum_{q\in Q} F_q^T \otimes F_q^T$ and $\sum_{q\in Q} A_q^T \otimes A_q^T$ are similar matrices, and hence they have the same eigenvalues.

Since all equivalent minimal realizations are isomorphic, it then follows that it is enough to show that if Σ is strongly stable, then the result of application of Procedure 3 is also strongly stable. Note that Procedure 3 is just the subsequent application of Procedure 1 or Procedure 2, hence it is enough to show that Procedures 1 – 2 preserve strong stability. Recall from Remark 6 the notion of the dual system Σ^T and recall that if $\hat{\Sigma}$ is the result of applying Procedure 1 to Σ^T, then $\hat{\Sigma}^T$ is the result of applying Procedure 2 to Σ. Notice that the matrices of Σ^T are A_q^T, $q \in Q$, and $(\sum_{q\in Q} A_q \otimes A_q)^T = \sum_{q\in Q} A_q^T \otimes A_q^T$. Since taking transposes preserves eigenvalues, it then follows that an LSS is stable if and only if its dual system is stable. Hence, if we show that Procedure 1 preserves strong stability, then by a duality argument we get that Procedure 2 also preserves strong stability.

Thus, it is left to show that Procedure 1 preserves strong stability. If Σ is strongly stable, then by Lemma 7, there exists $P > 0$ such that $P - \sum_{q\in Q} A_q^T P A_q > 0$. Consider the partitioning of the matrix A_q described in Procedure 1 to Σ, and let $P = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{12} \\ P_{21} & P_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ be a compatible partitioning of P, i.e., P_{11} is $r \times r$. From **Observation 1** in the proof of Lemma 3 it then follows that

$$P - \sum_{q\in Q} A_q^T P A_q = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} - \sum_{q\in Q} (A_q^R)^T P_{11} A_q^R & \star \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, $P - \sum_{q\in Q} A_q^T P A_q > 0$ implies that $P_{11} - \sum_{q\in Q} (A_q^R)^T P_{11} A_q^R > 0$. From $P > 0$ it follows that $P_{11} > 0$. From Lemma 7, it follows that $\sum_{q\in Q} (A_q^R)^T \otimes (A_q^R)^T$ is stable, i.e., the result of applying Procedure 1 to Σ is strongly stable. $\square$

Appendix J.

Proof of Lemma 9. That nice observability grammian exists, it is unique and it is positive semi-definite follows from Lemma 7 by setting $\mathcal{G} = \sum_{q \in Q} C_q^T C_q$ and $F_q = A_q$. The corresponding statement for observability grammians follows from Lemma 7, by applying it to $F_q = A_q^T$, $q \in Q$ and $\mathcal{G} = \sum_{q \in Q} B_q B_q^T$ and by noticing that $(A_q^T \otimes A_q^T)^T = A_q \otimes A_q$; hence, $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T \otimes A_q^T$ is stable if and only if $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q \otimes A_q$ is stable. ☐

Appendix K.

Proof of Lemma 13. The proof is inspired by the PhD thesis [18]. Without loss of generality, we assume that Σ is already balanced and hence $\Sigma_{\mathrm{bal}} = \Sigma$. Assume that the balanced observability and controllability grammians are of the following form.

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix}.$$

We use the notation of the partitioning in (14). Moreover, we will use the continuous time notation generically, e.g., $u(t)$ will denote either a continuous time input or a discrete time input depending on the context.

Fix an input $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and a switching signal $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and denote by $x(t)$ the corresponding state trajectory of Σ and by $\hat{x}(t)$ the corresponding state trajectory of the reduced order model $\hat{\Sigma}$. Consider the decomposition $x(t) = (x_1(t), x_2(t))$ where $x_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, and define

$$z(t) = A_{q(t),21}\hat{x}(t) + B_{q(t),2}u(t).$$

With this notation, consider the following vectors

$$X_c(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1(t) + \hat{x}(t) \\ x_2(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_o(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1(t) - \hat{x}(t) \\ x_2(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

An easy calculation reveals that (with δ the derivative- or forward shift operator)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta X_c(t) &= A_{q(t)} X_c(t) - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} + 2B_{q(t)}u(t) \\ \delta X_o(t) &= A_{q(t)} X_o(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}.$$

We will show that

Lemma 17.

$$4\beta^2||u||_2^2 \geq \begin{cases} \int_0^t X_o(s)^T C_{q(s)}^T C_{q(s)} X_o(s) ds & \textit{(cont.)} \\ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} X_o(s)^T C_{q(s)}^T C_{q(s)} X_o(s) & \textit{(disc.)} \end{cases} \tag{K.1}$$

Before proving Lemma 17, notice that $C_{q(t)}X_o(t) = y(t) - \hat{y}(t)$, where $y(t)$ is the output trajectory of Σ and $\hat{y}(t)$ is the output trajectory of $\hat{\Sigma}$. Hence, (K.1) is equivalent to

$$||y - \hat{y}||_2^2 \leq 4\beta^2||u||_2^2$$

From this Lemma 13 follows.

In order to prove Lemma 17, we proceed as follows. Notice that

$$\delta(X_o^T(t)\Lambda X_o(t)) = \begin{cases} 2X_o(t)^T A_{q(t)}^T \Lambda X_o(t) + 2\beta z(t)^T x_2(t) & \text{(cont.)} \\ \\ X_o^T(t) A_{q(t)}^T \Lambda A_{q(t)} X_o(t) \\ \quad +2\beta X_o(t)^T A_{q(t)}^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} + \beta||z(t)||_2^2 & \text{(disc.).} \end{cases}$$

In the derivation above we used that

$$\Lambda \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} = \beta \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using this and the fact that Λ satisfies the observability grammian inequality (9), it follows that

$$\delta(X_o^T(t)\Lambda X_o(t)) \leq \begin{cases} -X_o(t)^T C_{q(t)}^T C_{q(t)} X_o(t) + 2\beta z(t)^T x_2(t) & \text{(cont.)} \\ \\ -X_o(t)^T C_{q(t)}^T C_{q(t)} X_o(t) + X_o(t)^T \Lambda X_o(t) \\ \quad +2\beta X_o(t)^T A_{q(t)}^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} + \beta||z(t)||_2^2 & \text{(disc.).} \end{cases} \tag{K.3}$$

By noticing that $X_o(0) = 0$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq X_o^T(t)\Lambda X_o(t) \\ &= \begin{cases} \int_0^t \frac{d}{dr}(X_o^T(r)\Lambda X_o(r))|_{r=s} ds & \text{(cont.)} \\ \\ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \Big(X_o^T(s+1)\Lambda X_o(s+1) & \\ \qquad - X_o^T(s)\Lambda X_o(s) \Big), & \text{(disc.)} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and combing it with (K.3), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & - \int_0^t X_o(s)^T C_{q(s)}^T C_{q(s)} X_o(s) ds \\ & + 2\beta \int_0^t z(s)^T x_2(s) ds, \qquad \text{(cont.)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq & - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} X_o(s)^T C_{q(s)}^T C_{q(s)} X_o(s) \\ & + \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (2\beta X_o(s)^T A_{q(s)}^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(s) \end{bmatrix} + \beta ||z(s)||_2^2). \qquad \text{(disc.)} \end{aligned}$$

If we can show that

Lemma 18.

$$\begin{aligned} & 4\beta ||u||_2^2 \\ & \quad \geq \begin{cases} 2\int_0^t z(s)^T x_2(s) ds & \textit{(cont.)} \\ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (2X_o(s)^T A_{q(s)}^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(s) \end{bmatrix} + ||z(s)||_2^2) & \textit{(disc.)} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

then Lemma 17 follows.

Proof of Lemma 18. We split the proof of Lemma 18 into two parts: one for the continuous-time case, and one for the discrete-time case.

Continuous-time

Notice that by applying Lemma 16 with $A = A_q^T$, $S = B_q^T$ and using the fact that Λ is a controllability grammian, it follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_q^T\Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda^{-1}A_q & \Lambda^{-1}B_q \\ B_q^T\Lambda^{-1} & -I \end{bmatrix} \leq 0.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}(X_c(t)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t)) \\ &\quad= \begin{bmatrix} X_c(t) \\ 2u(t) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} A_{q(t)}^T\Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda^{-1}A_{q(t)} & \Lambda^{-1}B_{q(t)} \\ B_{q(t)}^T\Lambda^{-1} & -I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_c(t) \\ 2u(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\qquad + 4||u(t)||_2^2 - 2X_c^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad\leq 4||u(t)||_2^2 - 2X_c^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

A simple computation reveals that $X_c^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\beta}x_2^T(t)z(t)$, and thus

$$\frac{d}{dt}(X_c^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t)) \leq 4||u(t)||_2^2 - 2\frac{1}{\beta}x_2^T(t)z(t)$$

By noticing that $X_c(0) = 0$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} X_c(t)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t) &= \int_0^t \frac{d}{ds}(X_c(s)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(s))ds \\ &\leq 4\int_0^t ||u(s)||^2 ds - 2\int_0^t \frac{1}{\beta}x_2^T(s)z(s)ds \end{aligned}$$

Since $X_c(t)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t) \geq 0$,

$$2\int_0^t z(s)^T x_2(s)ds \leq 4\beta\int_0^t ||u(s)||_2^2 ds \leq 4\beta||u||_2^2 \tag{K.5}$$

Discrete-time

By applying Lemma 16 with $A = A_q^T$ and $S = B_q^T$ for the discrete-time case, equation (10) for $\mathcal{P} = \Lambda$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_q^T\Lambda^{-1}A_q - \Lambda^{-1} & A_q^T\Lambda^{-1}B_q \\ B_q^T\Lambda^{-1}A_q & B_q^T\Lambda^{-1}B_q - I \end{bmatrix} \leq 0. \tag{K.6}$$

Hence, by using (K.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
&X_c(t+1)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t+1) - X_c^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t)\\
&\quad = \begin{bmatrix} X_c(t) \\ 2u(t) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} A_q^T\Lambda^{-1}A_q - \Lambda^{-1} & A_q^T\Lambda^{-1}B_q \\ B_q^T\Lambda^{-1}A_q & B_q^T\Lambda^{-1}B_q - I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_c(t) \\ 2u(t) \end{bmatrix}\\
&\qquad - 2(A_{q(t)}X_c(t) + 2B_{q(t)}u(t))^T\Lambda^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix}\\
&\qquad + z^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}z(t) + 4||u(t)||_2^2\\
&\quad \leq -2(A_{q(t)}X_c(t) + 2B_{q(t)}u(t))^T\Lambda^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix}\\
&\qquad + z^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}z(t) + 4||u(t)||_2^2
\end{aligned} \tag{K.7}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} 2\hat{x}(t+1) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} &= X_c(t+1) - X_o(t+1)\\
&= A_{q(t)}X_c(t) + 2B_{q(t)}u(t)\\
&\quad - A_{q(t)}X_o(t) - 2\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$A_{q(t)}X_c(t) + 2B_{q(t)}u(t) = A_{q(t)}X_o(t) + 2\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}(t+1) \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{K.8}$$

By substituting (K.8) into (K.7) and using that

$$z^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}z(t) = \frac{1}{\beta}||z(t)||_2^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(A_{q(t)}X_c(t)&+2B_{q(t)}u(t))^T\Lambda^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix}\\
&= \frac{1}{\beta}(A_{q(t)}X_c(t) + 2B_{q(t)}u(t))^T\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&X_c(t+1)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t+1) - X_c^T(t)\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t) \\
&\quad\leq -2\frac{1}{\beta}X_o(t)^T A_{q(t)}^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} + 4||u(t)||_2^2 - \frac{3}{\beta}||z(t)||^2 \\
&\quad\leq -2\frac{1}{\beta}X_o(t)^T A_{q(t)}^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{bmatrix} - \frac{1}{\beta}||z(t)||^2 + 4||u(t)||_2^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{K.9}$$

Since $X_c(t)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t) \geq 0$ and $X_c(0) = 0$, (K.9) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq X_c(t)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(t) \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1}(X_c(s+1)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(s+1) - X_c(s)^T\Lambda^{-1}X_c(s)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta}(\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} -2X_o(s)^T A_{q(s)}^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(s) \end{bmatrix} - ||z(s)||_2^2) + 4||u||_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

From which it follows that

$$\sum_{s=0}^{t-1}(2X_o(s)^T A_{q(s)} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ z(s) \end{bmatrix} + ||z(s)||_2^2) \leq 4\beta||u||_2^2 \tag{K.10}$$

□

□

Appendix L.

Proof of Lemma 14. In order to present the proof, we will use the following auxiliary result. Using the terminology of [17], define

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_1 & \dots & A_D \\ I & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ I & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & \dots & B_D \\ 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C_1 & \dots & C_D \end{bmatrix}.$$

It then follows that $M_\Sigma = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & 0 \end{array}\right]$. Denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the set of all matrices of the form $\mathrm{diag}(S_1, \dots, S_{D+1})$ such that S_i are $n \times n$ matrices. Denote by $\mathcal{T}^+$ the subset of all the matrices $\mathrm{diag}(S_1, \ldots, S_{D+1})$ such that S_i are $n \times n$ positive definite matrices. In order to define grammians and quadratic stability, in [17] expression of the following form were investigated $A^T XA - X$ and $AYA^T - Y$ for $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}^+$. An easy calculation leads to the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *Assume that* $X = \mathrm{diag}(S_1, \ldots, S_{D+1}) \in \mathcal{T}^+$. *The ith* $n \times n$ *diagonal block of* $A^T XA - X$ *is of the form* $A_i^T S_1 A_i - S_i$ *for* $i = 2, \ldots, D$ *and it is of the form* $\sum_{i=2}^{D+1} S_i - S_1$ *for* $i = 1$. *Similarly, the first* $n \times n$ *diagonal block of* $AXA^T - X$ *equals* $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q X_{q+1} A_q^T - X_1$ *and the ith diagonal* $n \times n$ *block equals* P_1 *for* $i = 2, \ldots, D + 1$.

Based on Proposition 1 we can show the following.

M_Σ **is quadratically stable** $\implies$ Σ **strongly stable** If M_Σ is quadratically stable, then for some $X \in \mathcal{T}^+$, $A^T XA - X < 0$. By Proposition 1 the diagonal elements of $A^T XA - X$ are $\sum_{q=2}^{D} S_{q+1} - S_1$ and $A_q^T S_1 A_q - S_{q+1}$, $q \in Q$. If $A^T XA - X$ is negative definite, then so are its diagonal elements and hence $\sum_{q=2}^{D} S_{q+1} - S_1 < 0$ and $A_q^T S_1 A_q - S_{q+1} < 0$, $q \in Q$. Hence, $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T S_1 A_q - \sum_{q \in Q} S_{q+1} < 0$. Using $S_1 > \sum_{q \in Q} S_{q+1}$, it follows that $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T S_1 A_q - S_1 < 0$. Then from Lemma 7 it follows that Σ is strongly stable.

If $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are the controllability and observability grammians of M_Σ, then $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are controllability and observability grammians of Σ and (17) holds.

If $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ (more precisely, P_1 and Q_1) satisfy (17), then they are clearly controllability and observability grammians of Σ. Hence, it is enough to show that (17) holds. To this end, recall that if $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are controllability (resp. observability) grammians of M_Σ, then $A^T \mathcal{Q} A + C^T C - \mathcal{Q} \leq 0$ and $A\mathcal{P}A^T + BB^T - \mathcal{P} \leq 0$. From Proposition 1 it then follows that the diagonal $n \times n$ blocks of $A^T \mathcal{Q} A + C^T C - \mathcal{Q}$ are of the form $\sum_{q \in Q} Q_{q+1} - Q_1$, $A_q^T Q_1 A_q + C_q C_q^T - Q_{q+1}$. Hence, $\sum_{q \in Q} Q_{q+1} - Q_1 \leq 0$, $A_q^T Q_1 A_q + C_q^T C_q - Q_{q+1} \leq 0$. By taking the sums of $A_q^T Q_1 A_q - Q_{q+1}$ and by taking into account $\sum_{q \in Q} Q_{q+1} - Q_1 \leq 0$, it follows that $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T Q_1 A_q + C_q^T C_q - Q_1 \leq 0$. From Proposition 1 it then follows that the first $n \times n$ diagonal block of $A\mathcal{P}A^T + BB^T - \mathcal{P}$ equals $\sum_{q \in Q} (A_q P_{q+1} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T) - P_1$, and all the other diagonal blocks are $P_1 - P_{q+1}$, $q \in Q$. Hence, $P_1 \leq P_{q+1}$ and $\sum_{q \in Q} (A_q P_{q+1} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T) - P_1 \leq 0$. Since then $A_q P_1 A_q^T < A_q P_{q+1} A_q^T$, it follows that $\sum_{q \in Q} (A_q P_1 A_q^T + B_q B_q^T) - P_1 \leq 0$ holds.

M_Σ is minimal $\iff$ Σ is minimal By [17], M_Σ is minimal if and only if it is reachable and observable. The latter conditions are equivalent to $\mathbb{R}^n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_k=1}^{D+1} \mathrm{Im}\ A_{i,i_k} \cdots A_{i_2,i_1} G_{i_1}$ and $\{0\} = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} \bigcap_{i_1,\ldots,i_k=1}^{D+1} \ker C_{i_k} A_{i_k,i_{k-1}} \cdots A_{i_1,i}$ for all $i = 1,\ldots,D$. Here $A_{1,q+1} = A_q$, $A_{q+1,1} = I_n$, $q \in Q$, and $A_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise, Similarly, $C_1 = 0$ and $C_q = C_{q-1}$ for $q > 1$. Finally $B = \begin{bmatrix} G_1^T & \ldots & G_{D+1}^T \end{bmatrix}^T$ and thus $G_1 = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & \ldots & B_D \end{bmatrix}$ and $G_q = 0$ for $q > 1$. It then follows that $A_{i,i_k} \cdots A_{i_2,i_1} G_{i_1} = A_v G_1$, if $v = q_1 \cdots q_l$ and $i_1 \cdots i_k = 1(q_1+1)1(q_2+1)\cdots 1(q_l+1)1$ or $i_1 \cdots i_k = 1(q_1+1)1(q_2+1)\cdots 1(q_l+1)1(q+1)$ for some $q \in Q$, and $A_{i,i_k} \cdots A_{i_2,i_1} G_{i_1} = 0$ otherwise. Similarly, $C_{i_k} A_{i_k,i_{k-1}} \cdots A_{i_1,i} = C_{q_l} A_v$, if $vq_l = q_1 \cdots q_l$, $i_1 \cdots i_k = (q_1+1)1(q_2+1)\cdots(q_{l-1}+1)1(q_l+1)$ or and it is zero otherwise. Hence, by Remark 4 reachability of M_Σ is equivalent to span-reachability of Σ and observability of M_Σ is equivalent to observability of Σ.

M_Σ is balanced $\implies$ Σ is balanced Assume that $\mathcal{P} = \mathscr{Q}$ diagonal, then the first $n \times n$ block of $\mathcal{P} = \mathscr{Q}$ is also diagonal and it is an observability and reachability grammian of Σ. That is, Σ is balanced.

$M_{\hat{\Sigma}}$ arises from balanced truncation Assume that $\mathcal{P} = \mathscr{Q} = \mathrm{diag}(\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_{D+1})$ and assume that in Procedure 4 we discard the $n-r$ smallest singular values of Λ_1. Let us apply balanced truncation to M_Σ by discarding the $n-r$ smallest singular values from $\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_{D+1}$. From the formula presented in [17] it then follows that the resulting uncertain system equals $M_{\hat{\Sigma}}$. $\square$

Appendix M.

Proof of Lemma 15. **Proof of Part 1** Notice that $\sum_{q \in Q} A_q^T P A_q - P < 0$ is equivalent to $\sum_{q \in Q} p((\frac{1}{p} A_q^T P A_q) - P < 0$. The existence of a positive definite solution to former LMI is equivalent strong stability of Σ, and the latter LMI is equivalent to mean-square stability of Σ_{st}.

Proof of Part 2 Notice that

$$\sum_{q \in Q} (A_q \mathcal{P} A_q^T + B_q B_q^T)$$
$$= \sum_{q \in Q} p((\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} A_q) \mathcal{P} (\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} A_q^T) + (\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} B_q)(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} B_q)^T)$$

and

$$\sum_{q\in Q}(A_q^T\mathscr{Q}A_q + C_q^TC_q)$$
$$= \sum_{q\in Q} p((\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}A_q^T)\mathscr{Q}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}A_q) + (\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}C_q^T)(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}C_q)).$$

From this it the first part of the claim follows. Since clearly $A_q\mathcal{P}A_q^T + B_qB_q^T - \mathcal{P} \le \sum_{q\in Q}(A_q\mathcal{P}A_q^T + B_qB_q^T) - \mathcal{P}$ and $A_q^T\mathscr{Q}A_q + C_q^TC_q - \mathscr{Q} \le \sum_{q\in Q}(A_q^T\mathscr{Q}A_q + C_q^TC_q) - \mathscr{Q}$, it follows that if $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathscr{Q}$ satisfy (18), then they are controllability resp. observability of Σ.

As for the second part of the claim, if $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathscr{Q}$ are nice controllability resp. observability grammians, then they satisfy (18) and hence they are also controllability resp. observability grammians of Σ_{st}.

Proof of Part 3 Assume that we apply Procedure 4 to grammians $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathscr{Q}$ which satisfy (18). Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the state-space isomorphism which renders Σ balanced. Denote the resulting balanced LSS by $\bar{\Sigma}$. Since Σ_{st} has the same state-space as Σ, we can apply the state-space transformation to obtain a jump-linear system

$$\bar{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{st}} = \begin{cases} z(t+1) = \bar{A}_{\theta(t)}z(t) + \bar{B}_{\theta(t)}u(t) \\ \widetilde{y}(t) = \bar{C}_{\theta(t)}z(t) \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{A}_q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\mathcal{S}A_q\mathcal{S}^{-1}$, $\bar{B}_q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\mathcal{S}B_q$, $\bar{C}_q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}C_q\mathcal{S}^{-1}$. It is then easy to see that the matrices $(\mathcal{S}^{-1})^T\mathscr{Q}\mathcal{S}^{-1} = \mathcal{S}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}^T = \Lambda$ are equal and diagonal and satisfy (18) with A_q, B_q and C_q being replaced by $\mathcal{S}A_q\mathcal{S}^{-1}, \mathcal{S}B_q$ and $C_q\mathcal{S}^{-1}$, $q \in Q$ respectively. Hence they are also grammians of $\bar{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{st}}$, i.e. $\bar{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{st}}$ is balanced according to [14]. Finally, if $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$, $\sigma_1 \ge \cdots \sigma_n$ and we truncate the singular values $\sigma_{r+1}, \dots, \sigma_n$, then Procedure 4 returns the system $\hat{\Sigma} = (n, Q, \{\hat{A}_q, \hat{B}_q, \hat{C}_q\}_{q\in Q})$, where $\hat{A}_q$ the is upper left $r \times r$ block of $\mathcal{S}A_q\mathcal{S}^{-1}$, $\hat{B}_q$ is formed by the first r rows of $\mathcal{S}B_q$, and $\hat{C}_q$ is formed by the first r columns of $C_q\mathcal{S}^{-1}$. But then the stochastic system

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{st}} = \begin{cases} \bar{z}(t+1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\hat{A}_{\theta(t)}\bar{z}(t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\bar{B}_{\theta(t)}u(t) \\ \widetilde{y}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\bar{C}_{\theta(t)}\bar{z}(t) \end{cases}$$

is easily seen to coincide with the result of applying balanced truncation to $\bar{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{st}}$.

Proof of Part 4 With a slight abuse of notation, for $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $v \in Q^{+}$, we will denote by $Y(u,v)$ the value $Y^{\Sigma}(u,q)(t)$, where $t = |v| - 1$ and the switching signal q such that $q(0)\cdots q(t) = v$. Note that due to the definition of Y^{Σ}, the value of $Y^{\Sigma}(u,q)(t)$ does not depend on the choice of $q(l)$, $l > t$. Hence, $Y(u,v)$ is well-defined. Define the random variable

$$\chi(\theta = v)(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \theta(0)(\omega)\cdots\theta(t)(\omega) = v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is then easy to see that the output process $\widetilde{y}_t$ of Σ_{st} satisfies

$$\widetilde{y}(t) = \sum_{v \in Q^{+}, |v| = t} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{p})^{t}} Y(u,v)\chi(\theta = v).$$

From this, by noticing that $P(\chi(\theta = v)) = p^{t}$ it follows that

$$E[\widetilde{y}^{T}(t)\widetilde{y}(t)] = \sum_{v \in Q^{+}, |v|} ||Y(u,v)||_2^2 \geq ||Y(u,v)||^2.$$

Hence, for any $(u,q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Q}$, $E[\widetilde{y}^{T}(t)\widetilde{y}(t)] \geq ||Y^{\Sigma}(u,q)(t)||_2^2$ and thus

$$||Y^{\Sigma}(u,v)||_2^2 \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} E[\widetilde{y}^{T}(t)\widetilde{y}(t)] \leq \gamma^2 ||u||_2^2,$$

from which the statement follows. □